HD
4431
.N28

Class HD4431

Book .N28

PRESENTED BY

Municipal and Private Operation of Public Utilities

HD4461
N28

16
364

RELATIVE TO THE LABOR REPORT

OF THE

NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION

Commission on Public Ownership and Operation

By J. W. SULLIVAN

ONE OF THE TWO LABOR INVESTIGATORS

123 BIBLE HOUSE
NEW YORK
1908

(Weekly Bulletin of the Clothing Trades.)

SULLIVAN VS. COMMONS.

A Correspondence Which Explains Itself—Bro. Sullivan Refuses to Accept an Apology as Not in Good Faith.

September 28, 1908.

Mr. J. W. Sullivan, 123 Bible House, New York City.

Dear Sir: A copy of your printed attack on me has come into my hands. I wish to make sincere apology to you for my stupid statement that I had written the entire report. It was not my intention to claim authorship or sole work of investigation, and I did not realize that I had done so. My attention was bent on the other parts of the paragraph setting forth my confidence in the accuracy of the joint report, and in allowing myself thoughtlessly to inject that statement I did you a wrong which I regret with the keenest sorrow and chagrin, and which, I admit, gave you just provocation for a hot retort. I hope you will be able to give to this apology as wide publicity as was given to my original statement.

I am asking Chairman Ingalls to arrange for an investigation and report on our good faith and methods of investigation, as you will see by the inclosed copy of my letter to him. After such report has been made I may be able to take up the questions of fact, interpretation and economic theory which you raise in your pamphlet.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. COMMONS.

(From J. W. Sullivan.)
September 29, 1908.

Mr. Melville E. Ingalls.

Dear Sir: Never, I venture to say, outside the realms of opera bouffe, did defamer offer defamed an apology so extraordinarily incredible and preposterous as the one I have just received from John R. Commons. It takes grade in tomfool absurdity with that story of mining-camp life in which a committee wait on a woman to inform her she has just become a widow. "Madam," says the spokesman, "we hung your husband as a horse thief last night. To-day we've found out he was innocent. We've come to sincerely apologize to you—for the joke's on us."

More than fifteen months ago, in my absence, Commons, my late colleague as labor investigator, reported in print to the Committee of Twenty-one on Investigation and thereafter in the commission's reports to the public: "The entire [labor] report as it stands, except New Haven and Philadelphia, was written by myself on the basis of facts which I personally investigated." No statement of more importance than this to me, or of more significance to many men in labor circles, or to the commissioners of the two sides in the discussion of municipal ownership, was —I believe I may safely say—made in the entire labor report. It was a far-reaching assertion, if not the most injurious, in a series of personalities directed at me by Commons, the only man who in the mass of writing for the bulky reports attacked his colleague—and I was absent. That assertion he weighed, if he ever weighs his words, before committing it to his manuscript; he most probably re-read it in the typewriting, in the proof sheets, in the circular form going to the members of the Twenty-One, and he had ample time to review it in the completed volumes. Yet he now says he "thoughtlessly injected that statement" in his matter! If so, on what occasions does he keep awake and think?

That statement I denounced as untrue and defamatory in a communication to the Civic Federation as soon as I heard of it, which was weeks after it had been published, for I was in Europe at the time and Commons had not sent me his review before publication, as bound by courtesy and contract. In a number of letters later to members of the Civic Federation—to Dr. Maltbie and Professor Bemis, among others—I protested against it and other misrepresentations of me by Commons. I even offered, if he would eliminate his personalities from his matter before it became a part of the permanent records—the Reports themselves—to let the question rest. My remonstrances never brought my ex-colleague out of his spell of "stupid" "thoughtlessness" until, a few weeks ago, when, home again, I was enabled to make sure and publish the fact that I still had in my possession my manuscript of the considerable parts of the report I had written and sufficient documents to show my important share in the labor investigation. And it was only on the rude shock with which by this means I awakened Commons that he "realized" for the first time that he had erroneously claimed "the sole work of investigation." What he tried to do, in the plain intent of his quoted words, was to make of me in our joint work a character not only of as little account as the proverbial fly on the wheel, but one to be distrusted. Only when he sees that I am on hand to produce convincing material evidence of it does he respond to my repeated demands upon members of the Civic Federation that he be made to acknowledge the truth. Awake now, sorry, chagrined, since he is cornered and caught, he becomes anxious to persuade his fellow-commissioners that he acted "in good faith." Had I passed over to the majority during the year and more since he "injected" his villainous personalities against me in the Reports, what move would he ever have made to re-establish the reputation he had endeavored (by bearing false witness) to injure irreparably? Or had I neglected keeping my manuscript? Respectfully yours.

J. W. SULLIVAN.

Bro. Sullivan puts in these words his position toward Prof. Commons' investigation: "I have already published (page 59 pamphlet), the conditions in which I stand ready to respond to complaints from honest men. When Messrs. Gompers, Larger, and Bramwood decide that there is any need of an investigation, they will no doubt notify the Civic Federation. But there's a list of men named in my pamphlet whose complaints of unfairness against Prof. Commons stand prior to any assumption of a right by him to appear before an investigating committee purged of sins against truth to which they have borne written testimony. He ought to answer the gentlemen first."

HD4431
N28

LETTER TO SAMUEL GOMPERS.

To Samuel Gompers, President American Federation of Labor:

Being accountable directly to you, since you mainly were responsible for me, in the municipal ownership inquiry, I address these pages first of all to you.

You, as the foremost trade-union official of the labor group in the National Civic Federation, presided at the conference at which I was made a member of the Committee of Twenty-One on Investigation and the Labor member of the Committee of Five on Plan and Scope. Whether or not you named me, you were doubtless consulted before I was placed on these committees.

Besides, the trials of comradeship had settled in you some confidence in me. On being informed that I had further been appointed one of the two investigators of labor conditions, you wrote me: "I felt that no man in my wide range of acquaintance was better fitted than you to undertake a thorough, dispassionate, and impartial investigation and to report the results as you found them." When you thus wrote we had been associated in the labor movement half a lifetime. On many occasions you had shown that you placed reliance on me in serious work. You yourself nominated me at a convention of the American Federation of Labor so that I became one of its two delegates in 1896 to the British Trade Union Congress at Edinburgh. Through you the Executive Council made me General Lecturer on Initiative and Referendum in the years 1892-95. You have repeatedly commended my writings on labor subjects during the last twenty-five years, appointed me on leading committees at conventions and conferences, and have invited me to preside at important Labor or public meetings. Our relations have invariably been such that, whatever our differences as to policies, you have never ceased for a day to manifest your expectation that on undertaking a task I would end it with a report satisfactory at least in exhibiting fair endeavor.

It must, then, have arrested your attention when you read in my colleague's review his strictures on the character of my work while I shared his duties. You could only have felt dissatisfied thereafter in not finding anywhere in the voluminous reports of the Commission any reply whatever from me to this attack. According to my fellow-investigator I had in my review done what to him was "impossible." I had been "one-sided"; I had given "selected facts" and not "all the facts"; I had "picked out sentences here and there" favorable to private ownership and "discredited the sentences" favorable to municipal ownership; I had not taken the report as a whole, with the facts brought together in their true proportions, as he had done; his contradictions of me would lead the reader to infer that I had not summarized all the facts; I had perverted, misinterpreted and vitiated facts; I was, as it seemed, also to be argued against as being among "the defenders of utility corporations." And, in the course of a personal explanation made "with the greatest reluctance," my colleague would make a cipher of me in our work

by asserting that he wrote our "entire report as it stands, except New Haven and Philadelphia," on the basis of facts which, irrespective of me, he had "personally investigated."

Were these representations exact, Samuel Gompers might well be justified in calling on me to explain why in this important mission I had failed to be thorough, dispassionate and impartial. He and the officials of international unions who witnessed with approval my appointment, and union men in general, have a right to expect me to disprove what my colleague, become my adversary, has thus alleged.

I herewith give my reply. I would print it for my own peace of mind and as a public duty even if it were not actually called for by any one interested. I want to be clean in character in order to be useful. I will not permit a hostile hand to exclude me from the fields I have selected for social service. I intend to let those readers in whose minds my colleague has sown the seeds of distrust have their opportunity to judge as to which of us in our work for the Commission did his best to bring out the truth.

But I am by no means inspired to write what I do in the following chapters solely through a necessity for placing myself aright before those interested. In his review, Investigator Commons, in making statements concerning the private agencies of public service, has gone to unwarranted extremes. Not permitted by me in such cases to embody his partisan notions in our joint report, he was able to put them forth only when I was no longer on hand to check him. I recognize my obligation to the public to publish evidences of his errors in these respects at my earliest opportunity. And, further, the circumstances of his attack on me justify me in looking into assertions he made with my consent in our joint report on his own unverified inquiries. Wherein he there did injustice I make amends.

What I say against Investigator Commons' methods in the following chapters has been forced from me. Had not my team-mate, alone among all the pairs of the investigators, so far forgotten himself in my absence as to proceed not only to personalities, but to an unbridled license of misstatement, I would have continued to pass by in silence much of what I must now relate. The publication of this rejoinder and the impairment of standing certain to result therefrom to John R. Commons are wholly the direct consequences of his own unwise and wrongful acts.

Yours fraternally,

J. W SULLIVAN.

RELATIVE TO THE LABOR REPORT.

DID INVESTIGATOR COMMONS WRITE "THE ENTIRE REPORT AS IT STANDS?" ETC. HIS COLLEAGUE'S SHARE IN THE BRITISH REPORT.

I take up first Investigator Commons' partition of the authorship of our joint report:

"The entire report as it stands, except New Haven and Philadelphia," he says in his review, (page 91, Vol. I, and same page in this volume), "was written by myself on the basis of facts which I personally investigated."

To begin with our work together in Great Britain—two chapters in Part II, vol. II, "Reports of Experts—United Kingdom," pages 1 to 112 and 550 to 627):

When Investigator Commons arrived from New York by way of Queenstown at Dublin, June 1, 1906, with others of the Committee of Twenty-One, I had been at work in Great Britain three months. He and I were thenceforth at our investigations in Britain together nearly eight weeks. At the end of that time he had ten days to go back over our route alone, taking passage then for America from Liverpool in the first week of August. I sailed by a different steamship line from London at the same time. I had been in Great Britain five months, he two months.

On his arrival referred to in Dublin I passed over to Investigator Commons literally half a trunkful of written and printed matter relating to our labor inquiry which I myself had gathered. The mass of it was made up of the filled-out labor schedules from most of the eighteen British undertakings under investigation and printed matter relating to them, such as annual reports for several years, pamphlets, circulars, newspaper clippings. Besides were manuals of cities to be visited, letters to me from managers, and books and documents of sundry sorts pertaining to our mission. The collection, where possible classified by undertakings, was mostly arranged in large manila envelope pouches, properly labeled. While I had gathered some of it through correspondence from London, the larger part I had received from the hands of works managers, councillors and labor union officials of the cities on our list. As one of the two from the Committee of Five representing the Commission in Great Britain, I had in March and April visited the men in control of the undertakings in the Provinces and obtained their consent to have their plants and books examined. I thus visited as pioneer of the Commission Birmingham, Leicester, Sheffield, Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, and Glasgow. In each of these cities, while awaiting appointments with managers or between my interviews with them, I called untiringly, day and evening, on other men who might give me pertinent labor information. I had introductory letters everywhere to such men; I had already a personal acquaintance with many union secretaries and other labor representatives, having spent three weeks at Congress time at Edinburgh and trav-

eled another four weeks among unionists in Britain in 1896. Thus, no stranger, I obtained satisfactory interviews. In London, previous to going to Dublin, I saw the President of the Dublin Tramways Company, the manager of the Norwich company and officials of every one of the London undertakings we were to visit. Hence, on meeting me in Dublin, Investigator Commons found a good part—and the hardest part—of his work and mine as labor investigators in the field done for every one of the undertakings. Not the least helpful was that I had ascertained in many cases which labor men that we were to meet were able, and which not, to impart to us knowledge from their experience. In our travels onward on our itinerary from Dublin Investigator Commons had therefore usually but to follow my lead. Pressed for time as we were, I knew the whereabouts of men and the way about the cities. Not being detained in making groundwork inquiries, which were answered in the data I had collected, we were enabled to proceed at once to advanced queries. Councillors, managers and others interested, previously invited through Dr. Maltbie and myself, met the Twenty-One in the various cities, and in not a few instances I had ascertained which among them could answer queries as to labor. In London my assistance to Investigator Commons became even greater, as, besides knowing the city itself through previous visits, I had since my arrival there in the first week in March spent all the time possible with London County Councillors, Labor and other Radical Members of Parliament, editors, and men prominent in gas, tramway, and electricity undertakings. My colleague had never crossed the ocean before.

Comparing notes, separating the chaff from the grain, to some extent summarizing, "checking up" on points as to which one of us might have more information than the other, blocking out the plan for our report—this part of our labors immediately preceded our separation in London. For this purpose Investigator Commons and I met daily for two weeks, mostly at the First Avenue Hotel, Holborn, where the entire corps of experts were going over their work. Investigator Commons had proposed that on his return to his home in Madison, Wis., in August, he should write out the first continuous draft of our joint labor report for Britain. Consequently, at our meetings at the hotel, while deciding on points to be incorporated, a considerable part of our work was taken up in the discussion, and frequently adoption, of the results of my own observations. I had, and still have, a pile of notebooks containing hundreds of pages of pencil notes entered from day to day in the course of my work. My colleague, pen in hand, as we talked, frequently took down my words or phrases, which now appear in our joint report. In these discussions I gave him reasons for correcting not a few of his impressions. I especially directed his attention to the modification among its intelligent labor supporters in Britain of demands for further municipal ownership, to the absence of forms of co-operation, or profit-sharing, in municipal undertakings, to the lack of identity between the various organizations of municipal employees with true trade unionism, and to the fact that skilled workmen get from municipal employers only the trade union enforced scale, while the wages of the unskilled, who are mostly men of one grade, offer no true basis of comparison with the range of wages

paid by companies to men of many grades. To a greater or less extent these ideas went into the joint report.

Good reasons existed why one of us only should baste together a draft of the report in its complete verbal dress. We could not each have my collection of documents at once, now supplemented by further collections from us both. It would have proved an unnecessary cost and a silly proceeding for each of us, with a prospect of differences as to facts to be sufficiently indicated in paragraphs, to duplicate a general paraphrasing of reports and quotation of tables and official circulars that made chapters. As to mere form and arrangement, Investigator Commons had an interest not affecting me. The investigation was to me an episode; to him it was in line with his vocation and livelihood. He had a career as investigator to watch over. Conventionalities of college or government report makers, trifling to me, might look large to him. The probabilities of agreement in our reading of the facts increased with him as the recorder, since—considering the developments—I could afford liberal concessions. Besides, he told me he intended making up the manuscript during his summer holidays, the fructification being to him an extra ten dollars per diem.

When I reached Madison, Oct. 1, to work with him on the report, Investigator Commons, his vacation over, had much of our British matter in manuscript. Students of the university were at work on the wage tables for the construction of which we had planned some uniformity. At Madison and later in New York, I read the worked over typewritten copies of the manuscript as the parts were turned out. My letters from my colleague at this time speak of my doing this work. When in type, the proof sheets were read by me. In these processes I changed words and sentences, added here and omitted there. The British report was thus our joint production, at every stage, even to its writing.

I know of no whole set of facts in this part of the report that my colleague independently investigated. He had but one advantage of men in our work in Great Britain—the freemasonry of the Socialists and perfervid municipalists. From these sources—the two being much the same—he drew a batch of stories the refutation of which I print herewith in subsequent chapters. He never advanced the British labor investigation by a considerable degree on any capital point except "Suffrage," the documentary foundation for which, however, he obtained in part from my trunk. I could sit with a jury and point out, page by page, throughout, what in the report is from my notes, the printed matter I collected, the schedules from managers or the interviews at which both of us were present. The interweavings of the product of our teamwork could be traced by the contents of my notebooks or documents with my marks of possession on them, or by pieces of work done by others under my direction. For example: The matter in small type, pages 9 and 10, Investigator Commons intended printing as our own until I wrote its introduction and gave it the form of quotation. The work of the Citizens' Union, described pages 14-16, was brought to his attention by me and another member of the Twenty-One, and its secretary, at our invitation, met our committee as a body. The Glasgow Council session, described pages 21-22, was attended by me when I was in Glasgow alone, and the notes of the speeches on the

occasion printed in small type are mine. The labored attempt to offset charges of favoritism in appointments made at that session, down to page 27, was drawn out by notes taken by me while the heated Councillors wrangled. The quotations relative to Glasgow employees, pages 28-30, came largely from printed reports first given to me personally. The interview with a Leicester Councillor referred to on page 33 was mine. The matter descriptive of the Municipal Employees' Association, pages 36-38, I had obtained from its secretary in London in March and its Scottish District Organizer in Glasgow in April, with both of whom I had several interviews. In the compilations on pages 42-80 are points from my notebooks, reports, etc., as well as from my colleague's. More largely Investigator Commons' than any other part of our joint report is the chapter "Profit-sharing or Copartnership," pages 82-102, and in another chapter I deal with it as an example of his deliberate bias. The replies to the schedule questions, pages 550 to 627, were compiled by students at Madison almost wholly from schedule books filled out by me or through me at the works investigated.

At this point I invite the reader to pause and re-read Investigator Commons' averment that our joint report and investigation, except New Haven and Philadelphia, were his personally. That done, I ask: What was the reader's impression when he first read that assertion? And what is it now? If his impression as to my share in the British work remains unchanged, Investigator Commons made thereanent a truthful statement.

DID INVESTIGATOR COMMONS WRITE "THE ENTIRE REPORT AS IT STANDS?" HIS COLLEAGUE'S SHARE IN THE AMERICAN REPORT.

We come now to the joint labor report on the American undertakings—(four chapters in Part II, vol. I, "Reports of Experts—United States," pages 136-158, "Waterworks"; 490-536, "Gasworks"; 749-758, "Electricity Supply"; 885-897, "Answers to Schedules").

The question as to the authorship of this division of our report does not turn on the various meanings of the words "written" in Investigator Commons' sentence, "The entire report as it stands except New Haven and Philadelphia was written by myself," etc. A rudimentary conscience might be satisfied by looking at his word "written" as signifying, in reference to the British report, spelling off the words on paper; and if the reader should happen to interpret the word as meaning authorship in all its drudgery of thought and expression, the fault might be found in the defects of our ambiguous vernacular.

But no sophisms as to the faceted uses of words can pass as applied to the American report.

I wrote, of our joint American chapters on labor, as printed, twenty-two of the forty-nine pages of the text, apart from New Haven and Philadelphia, and I assisted in the compilation of the tabular matter and small type quotations. To particularize: I wrote, except a few lines in each, the whole of the sub-chapters on Indianapolis, Atlanta and Richmond, and considerable passages in those on Chicago, South Norwalk and Allegheny, and somewhat of those on Cleveland and Wheeling. For proof, I hold in my pos-

session my original manuscript, which I saw to it was returned to me by the typewriter in Madison, and which compares with the parts I mention word for word, except eliminations made in the typewritten copy by Investigator Commons. The answers to schedules I wrote entirely, except a line here and there relating to Richmond. In much of the matter not thus included as mine appear sentences or parts of paragraphs just as they were written by me before Investigator Commons worked over portions of my draft to inject in it his own personal investigations of political conditions outside the purview of our schedules after I had quit the field.

Six weeks after my return in August from London, having alone meantime visited South Norwalk, Syracuse, Allegheny, Wheeling, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis, and Chicago, I went to Madison, Wis., where Investigator Commons had been detained at the university, and during my stay there of more than three weeks I wrote 150 large pages (at least 15,000 words) as a first draft for our American report, from which we might select what should be approved by both. To Investigator Commons I gave a typewritten copy of this matter, which he has come to speak of as of his own composition.

The final editorial reading of the American report was mine, as may be seen by my marks on the proof sheets, which I have.

The reader has here before him a case of point blank assertion and counter-assertion as to fathership of the joint labor report which needs no sword of Solomon to settle. No one need re-read often or ponder long my contradiction on this point to weigh whether or not I have convicted Investigator Commons of downright falsehood.

And there was much of his work for the Commission in which his moral dereliction was just as flagrant and shameless. Of this further charge, I produce the proofs in coming pages.

"THE ABSENT ARE IN THE WRONG."

How is it that I have not hitherto come forward to contradict the amazing misstatements of Investigator Commons? Why did I not confront him at the meeting of the Twenty-One on June 10, 1907?

On April 3, 1907, I sailed from New York for Europe, to be gone a year, or perhaps two years. I remained abroad thirteen months. By a series of events beyond my control I was kept in ignorance of the fact that my colleague Commons had turned upon me until long after the Twenty-One had had their meeting and all the reports had been made public. To set out giving a detailed and convincing correction of Investigator Commons' deviations from the plain facts was not possible until my recent return, my papers relating to our work in common being in New York.

When I left for Europe it was with the feeling that all was well with my Civic Federation duties. They were over and I was relieved. The Manager had expressed, verbally and in writing, only satisfaction at my course. The Chairman of the Five, my colleagues of that committee, and the Chairman of the Twenty-One—with all these gentlemen I was on excellent terms. My sole regret was that I could not continue waiting indefinitely, as I had during months waited, for the final meeting of the Twenty-One, when the general report was to be adopted.

I had the week before sent Investigator Commons the manuscript of my own review of our joint report. I was not sensible of giving him just cause for offense in anything I had therein written. He had been made aware of our special differences in views, either as they had been developed during our investigations or while we were discussing them afterward. I had so frequently respected his wishes in minor matters, such as phraseology or arrangement, in our report that I took it for granted he would continue to proffer freely any suggestions tending to end our work in harmony, if not in unity. A remonstrance as to the paragraph on his practical politicians would have received my earnest attention. So I went away looking forward to having his comments on my review in a few weeks. And a copy of his own review of our joint report, I felt certain, would soon follow.

In truth, as to this last-named expectation, no doubt ever entered my mind. Sundry of Investigator Commons' doings had more or less at times disturbed my confidence in him. But every man of all the pairs of investigators in our corps, both Americans and British, had assented to an agreement not to publish anything, nor even to submit anything to the Twenty-One, until his colleague had read what he had written and the two had tried to come together in case of difference. The good features of this pact were referred to daily among the investigators while working at the London hotel. By discussing each other's writings a single joint report in each case might be arrived at, crudities might be cleared away, errors corrected, omissions prevented. And in case of divergent reports language offensive to either side could be avoided. I had seen our experts at work striving for the happy term clothing the idea of each; I had read lists of corrections one had made out for another; I was witness to a consequent emulation in carrying out our good resolve. This manly endeavor for concord and exact truth was to help lift the reports to a high plane. To the very finishing touch of his task every one concerned observed his contract with his colleague except Investigator Commons. I never received word from him after I sailed from New York, except that on May 13 Dr. Maltbie wrote me: Investigator Commons "says that he will send you a carbon copy immediately after it is finished." He has now known for nearly a year that I hold him as a violator of his word, and he has given no explanation.

The first copy I saw of Investigator Commons' attack on me reached me September 1. The Committee of Twenty-One had met and adopted its report June 10. Proof copies of the various reports had previously been mailed to the members of the Twenty-One from Dr. Maltbie's office by a secretary or an assistant. I received all of them, through my permanent European address, except Investigator Commons' review. This may have been sent, by mistake in the editor's office, to the Clothing Trades Bulletin, to be mingled with its hundreds of exchanges, sometimes opened regardless of the address, or by accident it may never have been mailed me at all.

A New York friend sent me in July a newspaper clipping, in which occurred the "personal explanation" directed against me "with the greatest reluctance" by Investigator Commons. I was astounded when I read it. I at once sent the Civic Federation Manager a statement as to the points raised, which later I withdrew while

awaiting a complete copy of Investigator Commons' article or news of his elimination of the personalities directed against me. I wrote a request that a letter be inserted somewhere in the forthcoming volumes of the reports, saying that I promised yet to reply. When this request reached the editor the forms containing the labor reviews had been printed.

Thus, circumstances beyond me, one with another, contributed in giving my one-time colleague a free field in which to parade his virtues as investigator, while I was far away, uninformed.

Had I received Investigator Commons' review in time I would have re-crossed the ocean to expose him before the Twenty-One and the public.

But, what is more to the point now, I should also without question have been obliged to withdraw my signature from whatever passages of our joint report were entirely of his authorship. Having violated his contract to put me before any one else in possession of his review, as I had put him in possession of mine, he could no longer expect me to accept any of his statements not verified by myself. My signature being thus contingent on his acting in good faith, my right to withdraw it was vested in me up to the moment that, all observances of our agreement being respected and both parties satisfied, our joint report and separate reviews should go to the public. And now that he broke that agreement in my absence it would be an imbecility to assume that it is still binding on me.

I have therefore within the last few months gone to his original sources and—to employ one of the phrases of his professional patter—"checked up" some of his grosser misrepresentations, not only in his review, but in those parts of the joint report in which I had accepted his word as fact, and I now give the truth regarding them as I proceed.

HOW INVESTIGATOR COMMONS DELIBERATELY FALSIFIED VITAL FACTS.

Investigator Commons, in his review, makes statements respecting crucial points that are in direct variance with the truth as he in some cases ascertained it, or in other cases could have ascertained it by going to the proper sources. Following are striking instances:

I.

Page 90, speaking of Glasgow: "In the midst of this socialistic tide, two anti-municipal ownership associations were organized—the Citizens' Union and The Rate-Payers' Federation. They started an active agitation, and, along with other influences, the tide of municipalization has been checked or stopped. We were led to believe that from these two associations we could secure information that would correct the universal indorsement of municipal ownership found elsewhere in Glasgow, but were surprised to find that both associations indorsed all that had been done in municipalizing tramways, electricity, gas, and water. They only opposed the municipalization of other undertakings competitive in character. No more conclusive indorsement of the success of municipal ownership in Glasgow could have been brought to our attention," etc.

This tardy "indorsement," sure to come from converted antagonists, has long been an alluring idea with Municipalists and Socialists. Despite itself the opposition is to be won over every-

where by the brilliancy of the communistic successes achieved. Investigator Commons wished to make this point for Glasgow in our joint report, but I asked him to produce his evidence. He spoke of the notes of the stenographer at the meeting between the Glasgow anti-municipal representatives and our Commission, as well as of the minutes of the Twenty-One's secretary, but he never produced his desired testimony. Next he introduced this "indorsement" in an instalment of a proposed joint summary, as he termed it, which he sent to me in New York from Madison. I marked out the word "indorsed" in the places it occurred and substituted "acquiesced." He dissented. On several such differences we gave up the project of a joint review. Not one member of the Glasgow Citizens' Union or Rate-Payers' Federation "indorsed" to us the municipalization of the city's gas, electricity or tramways. Secretary Robert Bird, as the spokesman, and other members of the Citizens' Union and the Federation, met members of our Commission at the Central Hotel in Glasgow, June 4. My own notes are the fullest that exist regarding this meeting. In explaining the purpose of the two organizations, Secretary Bird dwelt on their opposition, in theory and practice, to the municipal telephone, now defunct, to the unnecessary municipal housing scheme that had cost £750,000, while private capital could have done better work at a lower social cost, to misapplications of the Common Good fund, and to the numerous municipal ventures fostered by Socialists and municipal communists. When asked as to gas, tramways and electricity, Secretary Bird said his two organizations were not actually opposing them, but accepting them as they stood, were opposing extensions "on their fringe" that entered upon legitimate competitive fields. The gas undertaking should not deal in gas stoves and gasoliers, the electricity department in fittings and the like. When the tramways department set out in 1903 to make extensions in the surrounding country districts the Rate-Payers' Federation compelled it to give service first to sections of the city "that were crying for it," and the same body of citizens endeavored to prevent the cost of street alterations or repairs made plainly for the benefit of the tramways from being charged to the city treasury in general. Such statements as these were construed by Investigator Commons as his sought-for conclusive "indorsement" of the municipal operation of the three utilities in question. But if he had pursued the subject further, as did others of the Commission at the time, he would have seen clearly that the Citizens' Union was fighting the whole municipalization programme.

I interviewed last April on this subject Mr. Arthur Kay, who, as all Glasgow knows, is the leader in both the Citizens' Union and the Rate-Payers' Federation. He said: "Mr. Commons' statement as to this indorsement of ours is totally incorrect. We merely accept these existing municipal undertakings he mentions as 'faits accomplis.' As you put it, we acquiesce in what is not a live issue, just as we live under imperial laws of a century's standing which just at present are beyond correction in practical life. The members of our two organizations believe our tramways would be more justly—as regards other traffic—and better administered by a company holding a license from the Corporation than by the Corporation itself; and if the Electric Light and Power undertaking had

been worked with the Electric Tramway undertaking, both under license from the Corporation [municipality] experts agree that the result would have been more efficiency and less cost. The cleanliness and efficiency of our tramway system in Glasgow do not seem to me in any way to excel those of the privately owned tubes in London."

At a meeting of tramway committeemen of the Glasgow City Council and the tramway manager with our Commission, June 5, Bailie Alexander, chairman of the committee, said: "The Town Council is now agreed that the electricity for both departments should have been operated under one authority. There ought to have been one central control."

The municipalization movement was not "universally indorsed" in Glasgow even by the radical parties. John Paul, representing the League for the Taxation of Land Values, a strong and active organization, said to me in an interview, the notes of which I gave to Investigator Commons: "All done, what's done? There's as much poverty in Glasgow as ever. The Social Democratic Federation, at a meeting here ten years ago, upheld our municipalization. But now it calls the movement municipal capitalism." A member of the League, for a decade a city councillor, told me he withdrew his support of municipalization, as its results were not socially good. Among other points he made was that the 15,000 city employees of Glasgow, working for their own ends, constituted a menace to good government on broad lines.

In this instance Investigator Commons, contradicting me, published to American readers as truth the very reverse of the truth.

II.

It seemed to myself and several other members of the Commission that the rise in Great Britain of the Municipal Employees' Association, as well as other unions made up of municipal employees, was significant as a growing public danger in connection with the development of municipal operation. As I have said, on his arrival I had ready for Investigator Commons the data relative to this "spurious union," much of which he used in our joint report. He paid full attention to this aspect of municipalism, and was anxiously interested in the action of the Trade Union Congress of 1906, which passed a resolution threatening to exclude organizations made up of municipal employees in mingled occupations from the support of the trade unions. In his review (pages 98-99), he sketches the progress of the association, and after mentioning this action of the union congress, says: "Without the support of the regular unions the strength of the Municipal Employees' Association has disappeared. It was a temporary phase of the rapid increase of municipal ownership."

In April, 1908, I showed this paragraph to Richard Davies, the present general secretary of the Association, in its new central offices in London. He said, as to the disappearance of his organization's strength: "This is far from an accurate statement. We have never lost a single member by this action in the trade union congress. We have now 15,000 members against 13,000 two years ago. Here are our reports for 1907, in comparison with those for 1906, which show an improvement in our finances. As all the organized

workingmen of this country know, we have had serious internal troubles, resulting in ousting the former General Secretary, who has since started another organization among municipal employees. Nevertheless, our present reports, which are revised by chartered accountants and are therefore correct, show that our income for 1907 was more than £850 in excess of expenditures, which is better than the year before. We do not interfere with the unions of skilled tradesmen, but urge workmen of the trades employed by municipalities to go into the unions of their trades. Hence, really a considerable membership of such unions, and in places almost whole organizations, while not connected with the Municipal Employees' Associations, are municipal employees organized to promote our principle of benefiting themselves through their votes. For example, Mr. Commons, in mentioning (pages 41 and 49) other unions made up mainly of municipal employees, says that six-sevenths of the members of the Tramway and Vehicle Workers' Union in the Kingdom are in municipal employment. Thus the municipal employees in all other forms of organization are numerically stronger than is the Municipal Employees' Association itself. We are getting men in the tramways departments not reached by the Tramway and Vehicle Workers. Here is the financial statement for March, 1908, of one of our tramway branches in Manchester, which has 430 members, and we have four branches in Salford-Manchester. Of the laborers in municipal employment, nine out of ten belong to no trade—sewermen, scavengers, street sweepers. The unskilled trade unions have never got these men, and we are getting them. The joint board of unions and the Labor Party have given members of the Municipal Employees' Association until May 1, 1910, to assimilate in national unions represented in the Trade Union Congress. Changes which we have made in our rules for organization may set aside the present apparent differences between us and the unions, which meantime have not attacked us. The fact is, the unskilled municipal employees will not organize in the outside unskilled unions, such as the gasworkers and dockers, who, with several other national unskilled workers, have added to their titles "and General Laborers' Union," and are open to all non-tradesmen. I look for a federation of government workmen and municipal employees. Commissioner Commons failed to understand the situation as it is regarding our organization and made an unfounded statement as to the disappearance of our strength. We have as much influence now on the election of Councilmen as we ever had, and it is growing. We contribute money to the election of Councillors favorable to us."

I asked in 1906 many observers of public movements in Great Britain about the Municipal Employees' Association. The usual reply was that its possibilities had not yet been demonstrated; no man had yet come to the front in the organization who had shown the capacity necessary for a national leader. Secretary Davies, who has had experience as a Leicester Town Councillor, now gives promise of being the man for the occasion.

On this question again Investigator Commons wrote as a fact what he wanted to be a fact but was demonstrably contrary to the fact. That municipal employees, whether teachers or tramway men, policemen or public building janitors, clerks or laborers, will enter

into alliances for their own purposes, so far from being a "temporary phase" of increasing municipalization, may be reckoned on as a fact as well settled as office seeking. The only move made by the Trades Union Congress against the Municipal Employees' Association was passing an indefinite resolution, never acted on, except in the way of negotiations, which are pending until May 1, 1910.

III.

In his review (page 102) Investigator Commons alleges that in Newcastle, one of the places visited by our Commission, where private companies operate some of the public utilities, the Municipal Council is "decidedly inferior in quality and ability to others." His judgment of the Council of Sheffield, where the gas is supplied by a company, is equally characterized by antipathy. The recklessness of such opinions may be inferred from the fact that Investigator Commons spent, all told, less than one week in these two cities together. Of Newcastle he says: "An equivocal class of labor agitators takes advantage of the situation to get elected to the Council." Of Sheffield he has this: "In that town there is a peculiar inducement for the eminent business men in charge of the gas company to look with approval on the election of inferior Councillors, because the Council elects three of its members as directors of the company. The strength of the company is seen in the incompetency of these municipal directors, who are kept in ignorance of essential details of its affairs. With Councillors of this inferior type, and with the indifference of business men to the management of municipal affairs, the result is seen in the absence of any protest against practices which are undermining the municipal undertakings."

I showed the foregoing passage to two members of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress (corresponding to the Executive Council, American Federation of Labor). One of them, a member of the Newcastle Council, could hardly be expected to give a reply, though he is one of the most popular and highly respected Labor members of Parliament. The other, C. W. Bowerman, M. P., whose duties on the Parliamentary Committee, in Parliament and the London County Council, and for many years as Secretary of the Typographical Union, have brought him in constant contact with the office-holding and other union officials of Great Britain, said: "I have never heard one word against the Labor members of the Newcastle and Sheffield Councils." He mentioned several of his acquaintances among them. "Such inferior Councillors as are referred to by Commissioner Commons would be known to all of us," he continued. "They are not known, because there are not any. I consider that an unfair report." I mentioned Alderman Uttley, the only Sheffield Labor Councillor a gas director. Mr. Bowerman said: "He is one of the responsible men in the Hearts of Oak, a great popular national insurance association, and as a citizen has an unimpeachable standing."

Hanbury Thomas, Managing Director of the Sheffield Company, said:

"That portion of Professor Commons' article which referred to this company was not submitted to myself or an official of the company for correction, and I may say that I have read with sur-

prise and amusement the rather remarkable deductions he has arrived at from information given by this company to the Commissioners.

"The idea that the Gas Company, who are the largest ratepayers in Sheffield, should look with favor on the election of inferior Councillors is absolutely ridiculous. If the Professor were a business man he would know that business men of high capacity are far more easy to get on with on a Board than men of small experience.

"I am pleased to say that the City Council has always paid this company the compliment of sending good men to represent them on our Board. For many years Alderman Gainsford—a Colliery proprietor, and Chairman of the Derwent Valley Water Board, which is a huge scheme for supplying water to Sheffield, Leicester, Derby and one or two other towns—was a Nominee Director, and only recently resigned because his multifarious duties prevented his having the time to give that amount of attention to the Gas Company's business that he desired to. Alderman Batty Langley is a timber merchant in a large way of business, and is a Member of Parliament for the Attercliffe Division of Sheffield. Alderman Stuart Uttley is a Trade Secretary, and I may say one of the most respected men of his class, a man of sound common sense, and certainly not a Socialist. He was for some years Chairman of the Highway Committee. It is certainly news to me that he has had more to do than any other Director in fixing the hours of labor and the rates of wages paid to the employees of the company. It has always been our custom to pay good wages, recognizing that thereby we insured good service, which has all helped to bring the company into its present prosperous condition.

"With regard to the City Council generally, I am sure it will compare favorably with that of any other city in the United Kingdom. We have men in it of very high capacity, who are leading members in their various businesses and professions, and Sheffield is generally regarded throughout the country as a go-ahead town.

"With respect to the Gas Company, I am pleased to say that its management stands high in the opinion of the City Council, and also of the whole of the inhabitants, who recognize that the company as been carried on as much for the benefit of the consumers as for the shareholders. The exceptionally low price at which gas is now sold, viz., 1s. 4d. down to 1s. per 1,000 cubic feet, is ample proof of this. Our Chairman, Sir Frederick Mappin, has for many years been looked upon as the foremost of Sheffield's citizens. He has been Mayor, Master Cutler, Member of Parliament for one of the Divisions, and Chairman of the Technical Department of the University (in fact, he was the making of this Department), and has occupied every position of honor it was possible for the town to place him in. Sheffield is his native place, and it has never possessed a son who has been more disinterestedly devoted to its welfare.

"I think these facts are sufficient in themselves to refute the statement that there have been any practices on the part of the company calculated to undermine municipal undertakings.

"The Professor's other comments are equally unfortunate, and were I to go through them in detail I should find myself obliged to contradict most of the conclusions he has drawn."

IV.

Investigator Commons' statements against the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Gas Company brought out these comments from W. Doig Gibb, its Chief Engineer:

"The sentence (page 102),—'The presence of private gas, electricity and water companies, with their representatives in the Council, prevents the leading business men from interesting themselves in the success of the municipal government, while an equivocal class of labor agitators takes advantage of the situation to get elected on the Council'—is absolute nonsense. I have never heard such an opinion expressed by any one in Newcastle.

"It is next to impossible to have Councillors of any standing without a few of them being interested in the local semi-public enterprises, such as the gas company here is. But when any business connected with their company is being discussed in the Council Chamber the interested members very seldom take any part, and then only by way of explanation. Indeed, the Secretary and myself think that the gas company is probably handicapped by having two of their directors on the Council, inasmuch as they are both sensible men, and if not interested would vote for common sense proposals. As it is, they neither influence the Council nor vote.

"The gas company at Newcastle does not pay its organized common labor the same minimum as the municipality (page 107). One or two isolated cases may have been taken to prove this, but the general practice is undoubtedly that the gas company pays from two to four shillings per man per week more.

" 'The presence of a strong labor organization' (page 110) has nothing whatever to do with stokers working five hours for eight hours' pay. As a matter of fact, the stokers work as follows: Each eight-hour shift is divided into four periods ('charges'), each consisting of three-quarters of an hour work and one hour and a quarter rest. Thus in eight hours three hours is actually working time, and at the end of the fourth period of two hours the men are not kept to take their rest of an hour and a quarter, but can go home. The eight hours nominal shift, therefore, consists of three hours' work and six and three-quarters hours in all at the works. The men are paid by 'charges' and not by hours. No stoker could work continually for eight hours, and the Newcastle custom is the ordinary one throughout all gas works, whether union shops or otherwise.

"After inquiries I am unable to find that Professor Commons submitted any manuscript or proof to any official of this company for correction. It is difficult to check his figures, but I am not in agreement with many of them."

Investigator Commons' bold travesty of scientific observation in these instances brings him to print rash, foolish and evidently forejudged conclusions as facts he had ascertained and presumably verified.

MAKING OUT A CASE AGAINST A COMPANY, NO MATTER WHAT THE FACTS.

Investigator Commons was the sole writer of the sub-chapter, "Profit Sharing or Copartnership (pages 82-88, "Reports of Experts—United Kingdom"), and he is the authority for references

elsewhere in the joint report to the South Metropolitan Gas Company, London. My permission to him to proceed without me in this and several other cases of private undertakings came about chiefly through his baseless assumption, largely by insinuation, that somehow I was expected to defend the acts, questionable or otherwise, of the companies under investigation. To this point I shall refer hereafter, but enough to say here that when Investigator Commons on one occasion in London alluded to this idea I told him to go ahead and give all the evidence he had found of oppressions of labor by the British companies and I would accept whatever he wrote. I added that of course he would set down such facts on honor and when published they would have to stand the criticism of interested readers. I was busy at the time with the management of the Commission's work, so I allowed him free rein in gathering material against the British companies. He was an adept in presenting such matter with a judicial pose; besides, as in social standing he was a university professor and therefore presumptively an American gentleman, why not trust him? In reflecting on my turning over this work to Investigator Commons I have at times questioned myself as to whether there ought not to have been with us a third labor investigator—a representative of the employers, to guard over their rights and interests at each step in the inquiry. To this my reply at this stage is, first, that I hoped for a fair degree of foresight from Investigator Commons in his unrestricted procedures, that he might not be tripped up afterwards, and, secondly, that I knew if he proved notably unfaithful I must give publicity to his shortcomings. That is what I am obliged to do now.

Before Investigator Commons reached London I had interviewed Will Thorne, Secretary of the Gas Makers' National Union, and Pete Curran, their organizer, getting from them their version of the South Metropolitan strike of 1889 and the development since of that company's labor copartnership. I had also had communication with the company's officials and given them our book of labor questions—Schedule II. At our Commission's London office, engaged in occasional employment in transcribing and condensing legal and other reports, was a Mr. S. D. Shallard, a Fabian editor and lecturer, and from him I heard the Socialist history of the labor developments at the South Metropolitan Works. In turn afterward Investigator Commons saw all these same men, of both sides. He let me know, from time to time, that he was heaping up facts, important ones, in the South Metropolitan case, greatly to the company's discredit. When, in October following, at Madison, he gave me his instalment of the report on this subject it seemed to me easily possible to get up what he had written, aside from the points given us in the company's replies and publications, by simply quoting the union Socialists Thorne and Curran and the visionary Shallard. He had managed to get from outsiders somewhere allegations of facts or interpretations of passages in the company's reports, to show that its benefit and profit-sharing schemes were methods by which the employees were overworked and in important respects tricked out of the benefits and compensations due them by law. This latter point, insisted on by him as demonstrable by his statistics, modified greatly my own favorable estimate of the

company's co-operative features. But he had not shown his matter to the company for its version of possibly inaccurate or controvertible statements. This I myself have done recently—April, 1908. The officials of the company had already "checked up" Investigator Commons' errors on capital points. Following are examples:

Page 84, "Reports of Experts—United Kingdom"; "In 1889 the company, in accepting the eight-hour system, had to meet a greatly increased cost of labor. The change from twelve hours to eight, at the same rates of pay per day, meant an increase of 50 per cent. in the cost of labor in the retort house. In order to overcome this handicap the management endeavored in many ways to increase the amount of work, such as making the scoops larger, detailing men to keep them in repair and to see that they were kept full, and shortening the periods of rest," etc. To this the reply of the company is that "it was quite the other way. The men, instead of having more work put upon them, were constantly refusing to do work that they had theretofore done." Scoops were not made larger; men had always been detailed to dress scoops even before profit-sharing was started. Machinery was introduced which lessened the manual labor. Conditions as to periods of rest, etc., are the same now as in the non-profit-sharing companies. But no other company gives, as does the South Metropolitan, the many benefits of profit-sharing, plus those of its various forms of benevolent associations, plus after ten months' services a week's holiday with pay to every man and boy, and after three years' services the same holiday with two weeks' pay. Instead of a growing oppression of the company's laborers there has been constant amelioration in their condition. The holidays were in vogue before the strike, also the superannuation and sick benefits. The benefits of the sick fund are now 12 shillings per week for thirteen weeks, 6 shillings for another thirteen weeks, contribution of workmen 3d. per week; superannuation 3d. per week—10 shillings per week at the age of 65 years and 25 years' service. Additions to pay since the strike have been, first, hours per week reduced from 60 to 54 with an increase of ½d. per hour; secondly, a few years ago an additional quarter of an hour for breakfast, with no decrease of pay; the men are paid for 54 hours and only work 52½ hours; and thirdly, last year an additional ½d. per hour, given to a large portion of the men. There is no need for any man to lose any time during the year unless he chooses. Christmas Day and Good Friday are paid for to the whole force. The employees pay but 1s. 8d. for their gas to the public's 2s. 3d. per 1,000 feet. They get their coal and coke at cost, delivered by the company's vans. They have company garden allotments, free to all, at Old Kent Road, Greenwich, and East Greenwich. The average holding of company stock and savings per man is now £60.

The company makes all promotions from within its force. In the offices are thirty-six sons of workmen. When slot meters were introduced the 140 new collectors necessary were selected from the working force. The contributions of the company in 1907 were: To copartnership, workmen only, £38,663 (including officials, £45,590); workmen's accident fund, £1,264; workmen's superannuation fund, £4,428; workmen's sick and burial fund, £1,615; cost of holidays given workmen (about), £16,000; to benevolent societies, hospitals, etc., £1,008. Through the company's building society its workmen have built or bought 230 houses.

Page 86, Investigator Commons: "The stock [of profit-sharing employee] can be withdrawn or sold only when the employee leaves the service of the company." Correction: "The members can withdraw their stock to buy a house, as many have done, or in any case of unforeseen unusual necessary expenditure not to be met by the weekly wage. The men who have drawn out to go to America have each landed there with a round sum in his possession."

Page 87, Investigator Commons: "The Copartnership Committee is simply a means of registering the will of the company through its chairman, and the claim that it is a joint committee with equal representation is a fiction as well understood by the workmen as by its authors." (Investigator Commons originally ended this sentence with the words "is false" after "representation"; on my suggestion he adopted the roundabout phrase instead). Reply by the company's speakers: "The only foremen who are elected as company representatives are the head foremen at each station, who are in the position of officers, and as such would not be eligible for election by the workmen. There never has been any attempt at interference with the freedom of the men in selecting and electing their representatives. Only very rarely have they elected a sub-foreman. All wage-earners, which includes many of the foremen, are eligible to serve if they possess the qualification. The sentence as to the 'fiction' is very unfair and quite incorrect." The three workmen directors of the company united in saying: "The paragraph is a libel on the committee. We contradict every word of it."

Page 89, Investigator Commons: "The South Metropolitan scheme [of sick and death benefits] is the oldest, having been established for officers as early as 1842, and being extended to different classes of workmen at different times," etc. It was the workmen's sick and burial fund that was established in 1842; and their superannuation fund in 1855, while the latter for the officers was started in 1890.

Same page—As to the mutual benefit schemes: "Membership is nominally voluntary but actually compulsory." Reply: "Practically all the workmen contribute to the accident fund because the benefits considerably exceed in the aggregate those obtainable under the Workmen's Compensation Act, and they always get the compensation without difficulty or uncertainty, while the subscription by the workmen is nominal; it used to be a half-penny a week, but it now ranges from 1d. a month to 1d. a quarter. The subscribers to the sick fund are fewer than to the accident fund, and still less to the superannuation fund. Thus it is seen that membership is really voluntary."

Page 90, Investigator Commons: "Engineers and heads of departments twice a year examine their lists of workmen and put on the fund all who are eligible." Reply: "Workmen are simply notified that they can join if they like. It is a purely voluntary act, as the figures just given show."

Page 94, after referring to the intervention of the Registrar of Friendly Societies possible in case workmen send him a formal complaint that a benefit scheme is being violated or not fairly administered, Investigator Commons writes: "This provision is entirely worthless unless the workmen are protected from dismissal by

a trade union or otherwise. Consequently the cases of inadequate compensation at the South Metropolitan Works, compared with what the act would require, do not provoke public complaint on the part of the workmen or investigation by the Registrar. The administration of the fund is under charge of the Copartnership Committee, which, as shown above, is a pretended joint committee of the company and workmen, but really a committee of the company." Reply: "This is unfair and untrue. Further, no man has ever been dismissed from the company for his action regarding its benevolent or profit-sharing schemes."

Page 95, relative to legal compensation for injuries caused by "serious and wilful misconduct" of a member of a benefit scheme, Investigator Commons says: "In the South Metropolitan scheme the employer and not the court is the final judge." Reply: "Not true. The twelve workmen jurymen are left absolutely alone to decide on and write their verdict. The jury do not hesitate to award blame to officer or workman if deserved."

Same page, Investigator Commons: "In one case certified to before the departmental committee a man who cleaned machinery while it was in motion was debarred [from company benefits] because he had wilfully done what he had instructions not to do." Reply: "He could recover nevertheless his legal compensation."

Pages 96 and 97, Investigator Commons: "Under the Workmen's Compensation Act, special protection is thrown about the medical examination" (of an injured employee) . . . "In the South Metropolitan scheme the only doctor provided when the claim is made is the company doctor, who also acts as surgeon to the sick fund." Then follows, as if a typical illustration, the detailed description of the case of a bricklayer, whose complaints against the company are still harped upon by its critics. He was on the funds for thirty-eight weeks and then complained that by law he should receive a higher grade of compensation. He did not get it and protested. Investigator Commons stands up for him as if protecting a group of the downtrodden. Reply: "His fellow workmen began to regard this man as a malingerer as eight months passed by. He was examined not only by the company doctor, but by his club doctor and a doctor of his own choice. A few weeks after this protest he accepted the verdict of these doctors and the workmen's jury, and came back to work. He is working now for the company, the same as if he had never complained against its treatment. So far from being typical, this was the only disputed case ever up. Why cite it and overlook the many in which workmen have been dealt with liberally? An instance: Laborer Dyball some years ago lost a leg and the heel of the other foot in an accident at the works. By law he could not have got more than £300. Up to April, 1908, he had received more than £700 and was still receiving £1 per week."

Page 97, Investigator Commons, as one of his counts against the company, cites that three of its twenty-three widow pensioners were paid less than the minimum stipulated in the rules. Reply: "One of the three is a widow with no claim on the fund, as the fatal accident to her husband happened in 1895, three years before the fund was started. The other two are children, for whom ample provision was made."

Page 98, Investigator Commons: "Their [the employees'] contributions have paid all the extra benefits which the [South Metropolitan Company's] scheme provides and an additional amount of £380 as a contributon in aid of the company in paying the compensation for which under the [Workmen's Compensation] Act the company is responsible." Reply: "Instead of the employees paying £380 more in the eight years than the extra benefit received it was actually over £1,000 the other way, if the doctors' fees had been properly charged. The sick fund paid about £1,500 that should have been charged to the accident fund."

Page 43, Investigator Commons: "The twelve-hour and two-shift system [instead of eight hours and three shifts] was restored in two stations by vote of the unorganized gas workers, on the ground that the increased amount of work was too much for eight hours." Investigator Commons fails to tell his readers that the twelve-hour shifts at one of the two stations, which together employ about one-third the entire force, are worked in the winter only, when the three shifts of the summer force all find work with the change in demand. The fewer retorts in use in the summer give the hands work in the eight-hour shifts.

On July 18, 1906, Sir George Livesey met the Commission at the company's offices, 709 Old Kent Road, Investigator Commons being present. I took full notes of Sir George's remarks and replies to questions, had them afterward typewritten, and gave Investigator Commons a copy. He could therefore not plead that he was not aware of these statements by Sir George regarding the twelve (really eleven) hour shifts:

"There are three shifts at Old Kent Road and Vauxhall Works, and two at Greenwich. At Rotherhithe the men work two shifts of about 11 hours in winter and three of eight hours in summer. The two-shift man does about one-fifth more work than the three-shift man. He is paid in proportion to the amount of coal handled. The men at Rotherhithe say they would prefer two shifts throughout the year. The two shifts were started about six years ago."

Page 110, Volume 1, in his review of the Labor Report ("Labor and Politics"), Investigator Commons writes: "This twelve-hour system [at two of the South Metropolitan Company's stations], resulting from the smashing of the union and the overwork of the employees, is approved in some quarters as a 'genuine example of co-operation.'" This sneer bears reference to what I had written in my review respecting labor conditions at the company's works (page 61): "Its employees' stock in the company represents a larger sum than is similarly possessed by any equal number of laborers in England, and its provisions for sickness, death and old age are unusual. Ninety-odd per cent. of the employees of these works save something. A Labor Liberal member of Parliament said of the Company to one of our committee: 'A gas worker can nowhere get a better job.' The Co-operative Union accepts the works as a genuine example of co-operation."

Investigator Commons makes much of the strike of the gas workers in 1889 and joins with the embittered leaders of that strike and the Socialists in regarding the noteworthy results of the company's labor copartnership methods as simply the outcome of union wrecking and labor sweating. He fails to give a true account anywhere of the friendly attitude of the company toward trade union-

ism or of the attitude of trade unions (other than that of the gas workers) toward the company.

Nearly a decade ago, Sir George Livesey, the head of the gas company (Oct. 14, 1899), at a Labor Association conference at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, referred to the causes of the strike of 1889 and his attitude toward unions. After remarking that it was then twenty-five years since he suggested the sliding scale to identify the interests of gas shareholders and gas consumer, he said: "The relations of the South Metropolitan Gas Company with their workmen had always been of a friendly character until after the granting of the eight-hour or three-shift system to the stokers in 1889. This had been offered to but not adopted by the men, both in 1887 and 1888; consequently, when the request was made, in the summer of 1889, on the instigation of the Gas Stokers' Union, it was granted at once. All went well for a few weeks only; the union had got all that it asked so easily that further demands—some trifling, some serious—were made and granted rather than risk a strike, which was imminent at any moment. In October, 1889, a suggestion was made, at the Board, that it would be better to make friends of the men than to fight them. The Directors agreed, and the same afternoon the outline of the profit-sharing scheme was explained to ten or twelve leading workmen. They all approved, but those who were members of the Gas Workers' Union said they must consult the delegates before committing themselves to its acceptance. The union refused its sanction, demanding that the profit-sharing money should be given in wages, thus excluding all the stokers—about two-thirds of the company's workmen. At the time it was felt this put an end to the matter; but the yard men and mechanics let it be known that they did not see why they should be deprived of a good thing because it was refused by others. This was reported to the next meeting of the Board, when it was resolved to offer participation to any workmen, many or few, who chose to accept it, leaving every man perfectly free to accept or reject it, with no restriction or condition as to membership of the union. The stokers to a man refused, the others—about 1,000 in number—accepted within a fortnight. The act or condition of acceptance was the signing of an agreement for twelve months, with a proviso that any man might leave on a week's notice, with the consent of the engineer.

"The agreements were signed during the month of November, and toward the end of the month three stokers signed. The union demanded their 'removal', which was refused, and two days later, on the 4th of December, 1889, the further demand was made for 'the removal from the works' of all the men who had signed agreements and the abolition of the profit-sharing scheme. This demand could not be complied with, and, being refused, the union gave a week's notice for each of the 2,000 stokers on the following day, but some of the notices were forged. . . . The company, however, neither before nor during the strike (of which the cost and losses direct and indirect exceeded £100,000) made any objection to the employment of members of the Gas Workers' Union, or to their joining the profit-sharing arrangement; but after the strike ended and the company had agreed to take back unionists to fill any vacancies, the secretary of the union said publicly that they made a

mistake in giving a week's notice, and he warned the consumers of London that they would not give a week's notice next time, which threat was met by the company declaring that in order to protect the consumers of London they would not employ members of that union. This had no connection whatever with profit-sharing, and in proof I may say that when introducing a similar system at the Crystal Palace District Gas Works in 1894 the men were distinctly and emphatically told that they were perfectly free to continue members of the Gas Workers' or any Union, and that they, or any of them—for there must be no compulsion of any kind—were equally free to accept or reject the profit-sharing scheme, and so it remains at those works to this day. These statements of facts without comment are given because I wish to conceal nothing. A life-long association with workmen has shown me that above all things they like to be dealt with fairly and squarely and honestly, and I have found that where confidence is given it will be returned."

It is to be borne in mind that there never has been any dispute at the company's works with the 1,000 yard men or the hundreds of the skilled workmen of various trades. These have been employed at better than union conditions. There are engineers and other skilled tradesmen on the superannuation list not only of the company but of their trade unions. Excepting for a brief period after the strike the works have always been open, as they are now, to union gas makers.

Leading trade unionists of England have attended Labor Copartnership Association conferences with Sir George Livesey and spoken from the same platform with him and commended his company's labor copartnership. Among these are D. J. Shackleton, M. P., the leading spokesman in the House of Commons for organized labor; Alexander Wilkie, M. P., National Secretary of the Shipwrights' Union (both of whom have been sent as delegates from the British trade union Congress to Conventions of the American Federation of Labor); Hugh Boyle, President of the Northumberland Miners' Association; Thomas Burt, M. P., of the miners, and Henry Vivian, M. P., and F. Maddison, M. P., both of the Typographical Union. The productive societies of the Labor Copartnership Association now number more than one hundred, and all, including five gas companies, recognize trade union requirements. Another five gas companies have adopted the system this year, and several others intend to follow.

Profit-sharing and Labor Copartnership are harmonious in their relations with the British Co-operative movement, though not strictly a part of it. In a letter to me, January 15, 1908, J. C. Gray, General Secretary, Co-operative Union, the executive head of the united co-operative societies of the Kingdom, writes: "I believe the South Metropolitan profit-sharing scheme is quite genuine and advantageous to the workmen."

On Wednesday, April 22, the present year, I attended a meeting of the company officials and over 900 delegates of the men on the occasion of the presentation to the employees of a new hall on the works grounds. The men in turn presented a testimonial to Mr. Bush, who had just become a director after serving the company as secretary for twenty-six years. Sir George Livesey, in a

speech, said the company and the men had no differences and had not had any in nearly two decades. Nothing was kept from the men. They were free to elect their own three directors and their committeemen. Any man could make complaints if he had any. Both the employers and the employed of the company desired to show England and the world how to preserve peace and substitute thrift for unthrift, how capital and labor could join hands, and how laborers in an industry could become capitalists. In June £400,000 of the company's eight millions of capital would be held by its employees. The day could be foreseen when the company's employees might hold the majority of the stock! So far from being a scheme for getting the better of the men, the company's plan could in time at its present rate of progress permit the men to rule the company. Here was the possibility of a great, practical, and peaceable transformation of society.

The hearty applause and cheering that greeted these remarks could never have been the result of coercion or cajolery.

Two of the three workmen directors went over Investigator Commons' report with me and patiently pointed out its errors. Apart from these men, company officials gave me the same explanations. Mr. Austin, the third director, has since written me his replies on the same points. The three parties thus replying separately made the same statements. Mr. Austin complains that Commissioner Commons' report contained not one word of a long conversation between the two in my presence in July, 1906, when Mr. Austin had tried to impress on Mr. Commons the value of the company's exertions in raising the workmen to a higher level of comfort and happiness, as other of the employees when questioned by us had done. Mr. Austin knew nothing of dismissals of workmen because of their dislike of the copartnership scheme. He challenged this statement of Investigator Commons.

On the whole, Investigator Commons' account of the South Metropolitan Gas Company's labor copartnership is (1) as to various indisputable features, a mere transcription from the company's reports and other publications which permitted little scope for incorrectness; and (2) as to points obtained from partisan faultfinders, misstatements and misinterpretations of the acts, spirit and intentions of the company wherein it is opposed by a small knot of extremist and Socialist enemies. The Investigator's unchecked bias in this matter was such as to deprive him of any chance for a reputation in Great Britain as a fair minded observer and recorder of the truth. The company's achievements, the most notable of the kind in the world, have been thoroughly discussed by all classes, and it was left to Investigator Commons to adopt views of them no longer held to-day, even in trade union circles, except by men forced by events to be irreconcilables.

MANŒUVRING TO INJURE COMPANIES AND SUPPRESS FACTS FAVORABLE TO THEM.

We have at this stage of our examination basis enough for keenly appreciating Investigator Commons' capabilities for uttering false testimony, whether by audacious reversals of the truth or by labored perversion and obscuration. He now deserves attention as an adept in manœuvring. Some of his acts in this capacity I allowed to pass by at the time I witnessed them as not to be mended

by discussion; on others I put a charitable construction; others, again, only came well into the light after his review had been published.

I.

While I was in Chicago in September, 1906, just before going to Madison, one of the officers of the Chicago Edison Company gave me a copy of a confidential letter written by him to the Vice-President containing certain data, some of which was of possible value to our commission. This letter, of course, I turned over to Investigator Commons, with information as to its strictly private character for the time being. In November I received from the company a communication saying that City Electrician Carroll of Chicago had quoted to them from this private letter of the company, stating that Investigator Commons had given him a copy of it. The Chicago Edison official wrote me: "I am somewhat surprised that this report . . . should have been turned over to Mr. Carroll, who is not a member of the Civic Federation, especially before such time as the complete report of the National Civic Federation was approved and published." The President of the Chicago Edison Company wrote a letter of formal protest to the Executive Manager of the Civic Federation in regard to this underhand breach of faith by Investigator Commons. Even had the letter not been a confidential deposit with us, to hand a copy of it to a business rival of the company would have been discreditable to our Commission.

II.

Investigator Commons, in the opening of his review (page 88), announces: "I shall take the report as a whole, and shall try to bring together all of the facts exactly as they are and in their true proportions." And he announces on the next page his intention "in weighing and interpreting the facts," to "summarize all the facts"—which he asserts I had failed to do.

The most careless reader of either the labor or the other investigators' reports in the volumes issued by the Commission must have observed that nothing more valuable to America from every point of view came from any undertaking than the exhaustive information from the United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia. Investigator Commons and I spent ten days of energetic work looking into the labor affairs of the company in January, 1906. When not actually at one or other of the works or in the company's central offices, guided by competent informants, we were visiting the Central Labor Union's headquarters or the offices of the unions which might be represented in the company's works or in kindred occupations.

In no wise did we unearth anything to the company's possible discredit regarding labor. Day by day our developments, instead of revealing a soulless corporation's neglect of the rights of workingmen, brought us convincing testimony of the company's liberal treatment of both office help and works forces as to wages, hours, methods of promotion, and the sanitation so important in the retort houses. But Investigator Commons could not grow enthusiastic. His conscience was troubled by a mysterious piece of knowledge which he hinted to me darkly at times and which overbalanced everything we saw to the company's credit. At length, when it

came out, it was that he already knew from Professor Bemis that the superintendent of one of the works had stated on the witness stand a decade before that he had put some men at work on the solicitation of city Councilmen. This is the one point of the three or four he touches upon in relation to the company that is made to count in Investigator Commons' entire review. Yet in the meantime a written statement of the facts had been made by the superintendent in question (page 520, Part II, Vol. I). In the early '90s, during a period of industrial distress, in a force of twenty to forty laborers he had given alternating spells of three months to out-of-works of the neighborhood, among others to men recommended by their usual social spokesmen—their priests and Councilmen.

This one point especially is what Reformer Commons carried away with him from Philadelphia to give to the people of the United States. The barest mention, in a brief phrase or two, is all he has in his review regarding the full statement printed after the joint labor report in which every feature of the employment, organization, conditions, and general treatment of the company's thousands of employees of to-day is considered. He had had far more opportunity to know that all the facts of this statement were true than he had to inform himself as to the three undertakings of Glasgow, where he spent in all only a few working days, which receive extended favorable notice both in the joint report and in his review. In the British tour he was for six weeks much in the society of the Third Vice-President of the Philadelphia company and two of its prominent operative officials, frequently hearing them describe its methods by comparison with others' in response to inquiries.

While the Commissioners were in Philadelphia in December, 1906, Investigator Commons was by appointment several times in consultation with the Assistant to the Third Vice-President over the details to be embodied in our joint report. With that official he was one evening working over the very matter that appears in the report without his signature, leaving the task unfinished but under engagement to resume it next morning. He never returned; he resented my reminding him of his engagement; he never explained his remissness.

On receiving soon after from the company the manuscripts prepared by the various heads of departments in response to our schedule and verbal inquiries, I sent the package, untouched by me, to Investigator Commons in Madison for revision from his notes and other data. He returned it to me by mail February 16, unrevised, writing: "I approve of sending this out to the Twenty-One [as part of our joint report] provided Rowe's report is sent. . . This is the spirit of my understanding that we would leave the write-up of our report to the U. G. I., provided Rowe wrote up its history." Professor Rowe was in South America at the time; some of the statements of his history referred to were spoken of by Mr. Walton Clark as being such as Professor Rowe himself would not make were he to see the evidences of their error that the company was prepared to furnish. I therefore proposed to Investigator Commons that I should go over the Philadelphia labor report manuscript first, carefully cutting out all that he and I might not be able to subscribe to as being pertinent, or in accordance with our notes,

or equally reliable as the information we obtained by word of mouth at other undertakings. By these tests I worked the manuscript over. I sent it to him February 24. He had it in his hands a month when, March 23, he wrote me: "I hope to get the U. G. I. matter to you [for the printer], but I have been delayed because I wanted to write to Philadelphia regarding a few of the points, in order to see whether I could properly sign the report without having made a visit to Philadelphia in order to verify statements."

Only "a few of the points" were still in doubt with him therefore ten days before I sailed from New York. Meantime I had written him that Mr. Clark would make no opposition to the presentation of Prof. Rowe's history to the Twenty-One. In my last letter to Investigator Commons before sailing I informed him I would trust him to finish his revision himself.

He never had any further communication with the company on the subject. After I had gone he sent the manuscript to the printer with an introduction in which, by saying it was prepared under the direction of Mr. Clark and revised by me, he evaded responsibility for its statements. Thenceforth he almost ignored it.

In his review (page 107) he sums up relative to an important conclusion: "In the United States the minimum paid for common labor by the private companies is in all cases except Atlanta lower than that of the municipality," etc. Then he leaves Philadelphia out of his list of comparisons; it would destroy his thesis. (See reference 58 in my analysis of his review.)

Investigator Commons' omission of the Philadelphia company from his review, except mainly thus to misrepresent it in his wages summary and in his references to political appointments, is proof past question that he purposely blinked the facts of the largest import to our mission when they weighed against his side. This crime against the code of honor among investigators he could commit while advertising himself as an impartial witness and historian. When it is known that his misrepresentations were made in the circumstances just related, the reader has a measure of his capabilities as a trickster and dodger.

III.

Had I been within consulting distance, I should have opposed the omission from the joint report of a sub-chapter which, except the concluding sentences, had been written by me and accepted by my colleague in Madison, October, 1906, and which had been standing in type for months when I left New York for Europe, April 3, 1907. Herewith reproduced, it related how the labor investigation was carried on and how the joint report took shape. I wrote this account in order that we as authors might not seem to be too sure of all of our statements, and to excuse ourselves for possible omissions, and in general to be candid with our readers. If printed, it would have extinguished Investigator Commons' claim: "The entire report as it stands, except New Haven and Philadelphia, was written by myself on the basis of facts which I personally investigated." It was headed "The Labor Investigation":

"As a beginning, Messrs. Commons and Sullivan, as members of the Committee of Twenty-One, spent several days in Pittsburg in November, 1905, during the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, their purpose being to meet delegates from the cities which they

were to visit in the course of the investigation. They began systematic work in Philadelphia, January 16, 1906. Their labors in that city, Richmond, Atlanta, Pittsburg and Allegheny took up the next four weeks, when Mr. Sullivan, after being summoned to a meeting of the Committee of Five in Philadelphia, was selected to go to Great Britain in the place of Mr. W. J. Clark, who was detained in America by pressing duties with the company in which he is an official. Professor Commons returned to the University at Madison, Wis., and Mr. Sullivan joined Dr. M. R. Maltbie in London on March 5. On March 13, he set out to open up for the investigation the undertakings in the Provinces that had been placed on the list by the committee. He reached London again in four weeks, collection of labor data having been difficult while pursuing the important task in hand. In London, waiting on the managers of local undertakings and persons influential with them continually interrupted labor work. The office duties and the preparations for the coming of the Committee of Twenty-One, work shared with Dr. Maltbie, had to be attended to. The tour of the committee, beginning at Dublin, May 29, took up nearly a month on the way to London, where several weeks in July were spent in visiting plants, interviewing managers and others, and holding committee meetings. Professor Commons, whose time on this tour was much occupied by general committee work, made a second trip to Leicester, Sheffield, Newcastle, Glasgow, Manchester and Liverpool late in July, while Mr. Sullivan with Dr. Maltbie finished up the Commission's business in London, finally himself, after Dr. Maltbie's departure, attending to the details of closing the offices and bringing the outside work and interchange of civilities to an end. Mr. Sullivan's stay in Great Britain was five months, of which but the smaller part could be allotted to the labor inquiry. Professor Commons, being detained in August and September at the Wisconsin University, arranged with the Committee of Five that Mr. Sullivan alone should visit the American cities. Accordingly the latter, between August 13, the date of his arrival in New York, and September 30, went to South Norwalk, New Haven, Syracuse, Allegheny, Wheeling, Cleveland, Detroit, Indianapolis and Chicago, thence proceeding to Madison, where he and Professor Commons discussed the data the two had collected together and separately and worked on their joint report until October 26. Between November 4 and December 15 Professor Commons visited Chicago, Indianapolis, Detroit, Syracuse, Wheeling and Allegheny, reviewing Mr. Sullivan's investigations. Work of the two labor investigators on the text of their report was done in New York together December 20-22, while tabulating the wages returns, proof-reading and the insertion of additional matter, with the correspondence over it, took four months more.

"Of the twenty undertakings in America selected by the Committee of Five, those in Norfolk, Utica, Geneva, Toledo and Pittsburg were not investigated. The method pursued in each city visited was one adapted to the time at the disposal of the investigator, or both. Usually a schedule was filled out during interviews with managers or other officials, or in some cases given them to be written up, and inquiries thereupon suggested put to them, after which the leaders of the trade unions represented in the plants or the Central Labor Union officers were seen, as also city officials and such citizens possessing information as might easily be reached. While the restrictions of time occasionally limited the search for bottom facts in regard to controverted statements, the investigators believe that they have obtained the evidence essential to intelligent conclusions with respect to the part assigned them in the general inquiry."

IV.

One of my returns of facts ignored by Investigator Commons was a tabular statement of the increase in wages and reduction in hours of about one hundred unions among the organized motormen and conductors of America. It would have established the point I advanced (page 63) in my review as to the improvement in labor conditions being much more marked under street-car companies in

America than under municipal tramway departments in Britain. This table, as designed by me, was drawn up by a university student at Madison from printed material given me at the general offices in Detroit of the Amalgamated Street Railway Employees of America, and it was later verified and additions were made to it in the same offices, under President W. D. Mahon's instructions. It showed at a glance one of the most remarkable changes for the better that has ever taken place in any occupation, and it completely did away with any claim that municipal ownership was necessary in the United States to improve the well being of street-car employees, or, consequently, any class of employees organizable in unions. With this table in his possession, as well as the tables for British tramways to be compared with it, Investigator Commons, knowing I was anxious to get it, or part of it, in the report anywhere, saw that it was left out and then wrote (page 109) in his review: "The private [tramway] companies [of Great Britain], although paying less than the municipalities, have also advanced their rates of pay with the introduction of electrical traction. The same is true of the traction companies in the United States, although our investigations have not included a survey of these companies, and we are unable to make a statistical comparison."

The desire for prevarication of Investigator Commons in this case becomes even more astonishing when it is known that I had directed his attention to a report on "Street Railway Employment in the United States," in the March, 1905, "Bulletin" of the National Department of Labor, which took up 98 of the closely printed pages of that publication. I had compared President Mahon's figures with the wage statistics of this report, the result being that the two sets were near enough alike to confirm those from the unions in general. Investigator Commons had before him both the Labor Bureau statistics of wages and the union's table of comparative wages, and ignored them; but to make the point in his review (page 106) that the British Tramway and Vehicle Drivers' Union contained a larger proportion of tramway men in the municipal undertakings than the American Amalgamated Association had members, he promptly found in the same Labor Bureau article statistics for 1902 that suited his purpose. The author, however, said that the union claimed 70,000 members; that it was difficult to arrive at the exact membership, but that payments of monthly assessments for six months would indicate the 36,000 members. Points to be noted are: The British union takes in vehicle drivers (who in America go into the teamsters' union), and all the workmen connected with tramway undertakings, while the Amalgamated's membership in many places is almost solidly motormen and conductors.

V.

Page 896, Part II, Vol. I, our joint report, questions 5 to 10, inclusive, with their answers, were omitted by Investigator Commons. He says in the introduction he wrote, page 885, that the brief schedule answers were "not adequate." Complete, with the answers, they are in my manuscript as I made it up from the separate schedules, and they are in a typewritten copy I have of it.

These questions, with some of the answers relating to municipal undertakings, are as follows: Question 5: "Have the votes of employees affected city elections?" Cleveland, reply by Superintendent of Water Works—"The present administration is undoubtedly supported by the body of city employees." Richmond—"Not in gas. Said to do in Police and Fire Departments." Allegheny (Williams)—"All work for the men to whom they are under obligations for their appointment." Question 6: "Have they used political power to secure higher wages, fewer hours, etc.?" Syracuse—"As a body, no; individuals exert an influence." Allegheny (Williams)—"Yes"; (method explained). Wheeling—Secretary: "Only way to get higher wages and less hours." Question 7: "Have candidates for office promised higher wages, better hours, etc., for employees?" Wheeling—Secretary: "All do it." Chicago—Water (bureau official): "Candidates are at liberty to make promises." Question 8: "Are employees active in party work?" Cleveland—Superintendent: "A minority are." Syracuse—"Some are; party activity is to be expected." Question 9: "Are they expected or required to pay political assessments?" Syracuse, Allegheny, Wheeling—"A percentage, or two per cent." Cleveland—"No; the superintendent supposes many contribute, but does not know who does." Detroit—Employee of another city department: "The list is sent around in other departments; 'not compulsory,' the collectors say." Question 10: "What evidence is there of the influence of private companies upon the nomination and election of members of the franchise-granting and franchise-controlling authorities?" Seven out of eight replies was that there was no such evidence; the eighth was "no reply."

Had such admissions been made by the managers of companies, instead of municipal undertakings, would Investigator Commons have found them "adequate" for the schedules as printed?

VI.

While I was in Madison in October, 1906, I wrote for our joint report a chapter entitled "Working Class Conditions." This I submitted in the manuscript to Investigator Commons, saying that it seemed to me that the contrasting social environments of American and British workingmen ought to be given some notice in our report, but he might deem what I had written, in part or as a whole, as exceeding our instructions from the Committee of Five. When in a day or two he returned the chapter to me he said: "This is all right," with a stronger show of approval than I had expected. Thenceforth I regarded the chapter as accepted for our report. It was put in type in New York. But in December my colleague, without giving reasons for his change of mind, wrote me that he would not accept it. I decided then to print it after our joint report on the facts, with its separate chapter heading and author's name-line. In a letter to Investigator Commons, written March 21, one of the last I sent him, I made special mention that "Working Class Conditions" and my review were separate chapters. What he did in the matter is shown in the following letter from me to the editor of the reports:

Rome, Thursday, November 28, 1907.

Dear Maltbie—

Page-proofs 33 to 192 came last Monday. These are the first corrected proofs I have seen of Professor Commons' review or my own. An uncorrected copy of each reached me September 1. Previously, my only knowledge of Professor Commons' strictures relative to my review was gained from an extract in the Tribune in July. I note that Professor Commons has inserted in these page-proofs a considerable addition to his personalities.

I see that you (or your substitute as editor) have made up my "Working Class Conditions" as part of my review, with a sub-heading. This was never my intention and is misleading to the reader. That chapter was written for the Labor Report, months before I wrote my review. It had in my manuscript a distinct chapter heading, while my review had no sub-headings. It was in my proof cut off from my review by dash lines, had under it the author's line ("By J. W. Sullivan,") and had a heading in large capitals, all signifying that it was a chapter by itself. I intended it as no more than a setting forth of impressions gained from passing personal observation and from a variety of sources apart from the specific and sifted testimony called for in our schedule queries. That such was its nature the reader, prompted by what I now write, may be convinced through taking account of my warnings in it as to the difficulties of arriving at accuracy in thus surveying so broad a field. Had I seen a page-proof of this matter as it came from the editor's hand, before it went to press, I would have restored this chapter to its original form as to headings, author's line, etc., and asked to have it made up apart from my review. My manuscript, as you will remember, I edited as I expected it to be followed by the compositor, with even the type for headings particularized. But on your explanation that, answerable as you were for typographical unity, you could hardly promise compliance, I withdrew this request. I since have written you, in reply to queries in your letter of July 6, that I would leave to you the placing of my matter in the General Report, but it did not occur to me that you might so run them together as to efface the distinction between my two papers. Could I have foreseen their mingling, or had a look at the page-proofs in time, I know you would have helped me in preventing this error. In your letter of July 6 you said: "After consultation with Commons I have printed what you have to say on 'Working Class Conditions' immediately following the other matter you wrote." This is a pregnant sentence as I read it now. Professor Commons, it seems, knew just how it was to be made up, and it suited him. You write as if you regarded it as separate matter from my review. I inferred it was to follow the review, but as a separate chapter.

I could pass this matter over with less talk about it did it not give some apparent support to Professor Commons' reference, in his additional personalities, to "the practice of my colleague in going outside the matter actually investigated by us." I have just looked over my review proper, printed before the heading "Working Class Conditions," to find any possible evidence on which it might justly be said I pursued such a practice. To my mind there is none. Professor Commons knew that "Working Class Conditions" was no part of my review. He saw that paper when it was written, months before I wrote my review, as I have said, and accepted it as a chapter of our joint "Labor Report," but later refused to stand by this acceptance. The one quotation in my review giving rise to his fresh assault on me was sent to me as I was closing, and I inserted it subject to final correction in the proof, or previously, by him or myself, in the light of further facts coming to either of us. My use of its statements was obviously only in the measure of its accredited source. It made points that deserved to be brought out, as they were sure to be some time. Had a carbon copy of Professor Commons' comments on this quotation been sent me, in observance with the courtesies prevailing among all the other investigators, or if a proof of them had been forwarded to me from your office when they were recently added to his matter, I would of course have adopted the Glasgow managers' corrections. While they modify in a degree the Socialist's statements I quoted, they confirm the substantial truth of his complaint.

The rest of Professor Commons' personalities I shall fully deal with—to his satisfaction—in a paper I have in preparation.

If there is any part of the General Report yet unprinted I should like to have you insert this letter in it—anywhere so it gets in. It is my right to have the public notified in the Report that I protested at the earliest possible moment against Professor Commons' first attack on me, and that I again protest against this further attack of which I have just learned. I intend, in good time, to present my side of a public personal controversy which up to the present has been wholly one-sided and which I would have endeavored to prevent by every honorable effort had a duplicate copy of Professor Commons' manuscript ever been sent me, or a proof of his review been seen by me before it went to the public.

The failure to reach me of the proof you believe must have been mailed for me from your secretary's office when the proofs were sent to the Committee of Twenty-One cannot be positively attributed to miscarriage in the mails. So far as I am aware not a single letter or newspaper properly addressed to me or my wife has missed either of us since we left New York, nearly eight months ago. I have one permanent European address. Your secretary, or an assistant, may have mailed a proof to one of my former American addresses, of which I had three in New York. At two of these miscellaneous printed matter addressed to me takes its fate with literally heaps of newspapers and the like handed by the postman to office help every day.

If you have retained my letters to you written last spring and summer they will remind you what I wrote you then regretting that I had not yet received Professor Commons' review, of which I was in expectation every week, and saying, in effect, that he and I had been previously enabled through discussion to reconcile seeming differences in statement or avoid offensiveness in expressions of opinion. My review was written in the expectation of a continuance of reasonable consultation between us. I looked for any criticism of it in Professor Commons' review to reach me before any one else, that I might have opportunity of reconsidering my expressions, or even certain conclusions, if the ends of peace and reason could be reached while principle should be observed. Had the professor seen to it that my expectations in this regard were realized, instead of going into print in the newspapers in my absence, long before I knew what he was about, I might have rendered him a service in bringing his criticisms of me more nearly in line with accuracy and wisdom. This task is yet before me. I shall make clean work of it, I promise, as sure as I live.

Yours truly, J. W. SULLIVAN.

MANŒUVRING TO EVADE INSTRUCTIONS AND BRING IN UNVERIFIABLE ONE-SIDED TESTIMONY.

One example of Investigator Commons' fine play in the Mephistophelian art of manœuvring deserves a chapter of itself. The entire plot, in its beautifully sinister unfolding, forms a model for Belasco.

The weeks we were collating our notes in London before separating was a season of good will among experts and Commissioners alike. We were made to feel that all hands were working together in fine spirit, with truth the common aim, notwithstanding our theories. One day, profiting by this situation, Investigator Commons informed me that as it would be impossible for him that year to spare further time in traveling for the Commission, he had decided, after consulting with Professor Bemis and others among our municipalist members, to ask me to finish the labor investigation in America alone. I strongly objected to the proposal. The instructions of the Five, issued after considering the rights of all parties, required the investigators to travel in balanced pairs. In going alone to the ten or twelve remaining undertakings in the

American cities on our list, I should run many risks, certainly of misunderstandings, if nothing more serious. The work ought not to be one-sided. Investigator Commons argued that he would trust me to do justice to both sides; he would accept what I should report. I tried to avoid the prospect by proposing to quit the Commission and remain abroad. From this I was dissuaded through the remonstrances of certain of the Commissioners. Some days after I had assented to the arrangement, and just before the party broke up, Investigator Commons casually remarked that, as he had a week or two yet before his vessel sailed, he would go to Leicester and Glasgow, and perhaps Sheffield, to "check up" certain unsettled points. As he had just manifested implicit confidence in me, I could hardly stand on my right to accompany him, as was in strictness my duty. He went. He never voluntarily told me just where. Questioning him in Madison in October, I brought him to admit that he had gone back to all our British cities, except Dublin and Norwich. And from the form he had meantime given our joint British report I saw that no small part of his efforts had tended to minimize points unfavorable to municipal ownership that I had brought to light. He had seen men, mostly pro-municipalists, notes of whose expressions in speeches or interviews weighing against municipal ownership I had taken, and wrestled with them to find reasons for them to modify or recant. Among the men he had thus looked up were ex-Councillor Holmes of Leicester, Councillor Bailey of Sheffield, Labor Secretary Fox of Manchester, Councillor Sexton of Liverpool, Organizer Davies of the Scottish Municipal Employees' Association, and the Glasgow Labor Councillors whose speeches denouncing influence in appointments I heard in Council, April 5. Where Investigator Commons failed to induce some of these men to change their statements he found something wrong with their character. In Madison, on gradually taking cognizance of this neat piece of Hummel work, I regarded it in silent contemplation.

At a session of the Five, the week of my arrival in New York in August, Professor Bemis, on hearing mention of my approaching journey to investigate the American undertakings alone, displayed some anxiety. He could only consent to it, he presently announced, provided that Investigator Commons, after the conclusion of my work in any city, might be free to pay it a visit to verify or amplify my report in the interests of the pro-municipalist side. Had this plan been proposed in London I would not have consented to it; had it been said that Investigator Commons could find time to follow me, I could have replied that I would await his convenience to accompany me. But I was now on the eve of starting; the meeting of the Twenty-One to receive the reports was appointed for November; the labor investigation had to be hurried on if it was to be done at all. I could but say aye to Professor Bemis' proposal without bringing up any profitless question as to the truth of Investigator Commons' assurance to me in London that Professor Bemis was with him in suggesting to me the original plan.

I finished my task of visiting the American cities alone in six weeks of continuous labor during a long heated term. My findings, especially those against the municipal undertakings, I made

known by letter from place to place to Investigator Commons. Pushing on to Madison, my work of nearly four weeks there with my colleague brought the date of my departure for New York to the last week of October. Then, promptly on November 4, Investigator Commons set out, with my full written report in his possession, and during the next six weeks went to all the cities of my route, except New Haven, "checking me up." He alleges he also got together on this trip his stories relating to political irregularities in these cities involving companies not on our list for investigation.

The facts I had unearthed regarding the political degradation of municipal ownership at the Syracuse water works, the Allegheny and Detroit electric lighting stations, and the Wheeling gas works Investigator Commons found no reason to contradict in any but small particulars. He naturally made in regard to these undertakings some additions easily possible even to a novice if provided with my report and unused notes and with ample time at his disposal.

During the six weeks of this tour of Investigator Commons I was awaiting word from him in New York in the dark. I could not find out from any one where he was. I could have joined him in his sleuth work on the companies had he let me know what he was doing and had I judged his diversions legitimate. Or I could have asked the Committee of Five to pass upon the regularity of his proceedings. But his game was to lie low. We met at length in Philadelphia, December 12, while revisiting with other Commissioners the United Gas Improvement Company's works. I next saw him in New York December 20. He had meantime worked over parts of my report, fitting into them his new matter. He gave me the manuscript in bulk. On reading it that night I gained my first knowledge of his extraordinary discoveries regarding companies not on our list for investigation that he had written up as a set-off to my disastrous report on municipal undertakings that were on our list.

We had one brief interview on the subject before he took a train for his Christmas at Madison. I told him I could not accept off-hand what he had written about the companies. They were not on the list. I knew nothing whatever of my own knowledge about them. I had heard none of this talk about their campaign contributions and the like. He said he would confidentially give me, and if necessary the Chairman of the Five, the names of the authorities for his statements. I asked if his informants would tell me what they had told him. That, he said, could hardly be expected. I represented to him that, besides relating to men and undertakings not on our list, and the statements coming only to him through secret channels, what he had written regarding one company, if not others, was in my judgment libelous. His whole proceeding had been unknown to me, unforeseen, surprising, and aside from our proper duties as therefore performed. But he was in a hurry to get ready for his journey, and our verbal consultations over the matter came to an inconclusive end. I have not seen him since. We had no clash. My demeanor with him on the occasion went further than reasonableness; in every earnest way I could command I mani-

fested a desire not only to accord to him everything he could claim under his rights, but to keep in view our project of a joint report on the facts.

My observations of Investigator Commons' demeanor at the dénouement at this interview would tend to confirm a conception of the psychological dramatists of the current day. The old notion of the character in the cast who represents the spirit of disloyalty was that of a man of coolness and nerve, self-possessed, speaking his untruths unabashed and with measured fluency. Not so. The plotter against the truth in the presence of transparent and stoutly defended truth is by turns in speech reticent and abruptly dogmatic and incoherent, in manner nervously watchful and abstract and hangdog. His studied words are contradicted by the uncontrollable working of the muscles about his eyes and mouth, and the fleeting ashiness and purple suffusion of his face. He wants to get away.

The libelous matter was omitted after being given to the Five and referred to its Chairman; I put a footnote to Investigator Commons' Wheeling matter regarding companies saying that statements as to the political situation in that city, aside from what related to the municipal gas undertaking, were his, and, still striving for a joint report as to facts, I stretched a point and let his gossip about the Syracuse and Allegheny companies pass. I see that (page 94) he has surreptitiously introduced in his review a passage directed against the New Haven company which was not in the proof slips submitted to the Twenty-One. His unauthenticated statements against the companies not on our list are quoted by other pro-municipal Commissioners in their summaries with the respect due to testimony and verdict from a university professor.

Just at what point Investigator Commons might have seen his way thus to stack the cards only circumstantial evidence can show. Perhaps the germ of the trick found lodgment in his mind when I first showed myself disposed to confide in his honor. He early saw I was not to be a stickler in a small way for the rights of the anti-municipal side. This I made clear to him toward the close of our first tour together as investigators, mention of which now finds place.

Between January 16 and February 10, 1906, Investigator Commons and I visited the gas undertakings of Philadelphia, Richmond, and Atlanta, and the electricity works of Allegheny. Our findings were continuously disheartening to Investigator Commons. The pay, hours, working conditions and welfare and beneficial provisions of the United Gas Improvement Company in Philadelphia were all above criticism. The score of trade union officials and others we interviewed in Philadelphia (whose names are in my note books) had nothing to say against the company except that by giving more to its employees than the unions demanded, and better conditions than the municipality, it had carried its force beyond possibly organizable territory, especially in view of the poor development of the unions in Philadelphia represented in the gas industry. At the Richmond municipal gas works we found high wages for the white stokers and meter readers, and ordinary contractors' wages for the black ditch diggers in an undertaking that was a butt of ridicule among the gas engineers of the United States. Its bad service, for years growing worse, had moved the City Council to employ a New

York gas expert to examine the plant, and he had just reported that to put the works, mains and accessories in good workable condition would cost more than half a million dollars. In Atlanta we found the gas company's wages and conditions for the black laborers better than those for the municipality's black employees, while wages for the white skilled men, all points considered, were about the same as at Richmond (joint report, pages 496-99). The undertaking, a layman could see, after Richmond, was in a state of the highest efficiency. At Allegheny we found the municipal lighting plant the plaything of politicians and a joke to the enemies of civic reform.

Investigator Commons had a few years previously been investigating for municipal ownership at Richmond and Allegheny, and his fellow-municipalists were still writing favorably of these undertakings. He came to the investigation of the four cities now in question possessed of alleged data he had gathered as a writer supporting municipal ownership with a university library at his command. But the obvious state of facts we fell upon converted the beauties of municipal ownership in each case into a mere caricature of the picture constantly painted for the public by its apostles.

Investigator Commons was perplexed. He evidently foresaw defeat in our report. I sympathized with him. In his depression, at Atlanta he one day questioned me as to my remedy for the abuses of municipal monopoly. I outlined my ideas of a just, thorough, and efficient regulation. I went on, in effect: "While you and I may differ as to remedies, why in the name of truth should we differ as to our observed facts? You hold that you are a social reformer, and I believe I am. You look to methods I regard as socialistic; I to methods that are American. I would simply aim to have legalized privilege everywhere abolished or brought to the possible minimum. This, as we have seen at Philadelphia, can be done in municipal affairs by means of fair contract in performing work that, involving an exclusive occupancy of the streets, is the community's concern. In the United States we have examples of every grade of work by capitalist corporations for municipalities, from barefaced robbery through corruptly obtained franchises right along upward to honest and satisfactory service under franchises that stipulate protection of public interests. If you and I find examples of the latter class it is our duty to point to them as models for imitation. Now, so far as our investigation has proceeded you have but a sorry showing for municipal operation. The salient facts we have come upon are not the facts on which the followers of your movement have been fed. Up to the present you and I have much the same notes and schedules and copies of reports and wage tables. It would honor the cause of unpartisan systematic investigation if we could agree on a report as to facts, even if we should differ in tracing out their significance. I propose that we aim at an agreement on the facts, so far as possible, simply pointing out the exceptions where we cannot agree."

The response was a monosyllabic assent, not over-enthusiastic.

This proposal of mine thenceforth became an asset among the advantages Investigator Commons worked up for his side. When months later we discussed our selections for publication among the superabundant material we had collected, he set aside considerable

that it seemed to me might indicate a trend at home and abroad against municipal ownership. However, as he was obliged to make admissions enough to give ample room for the support of my views on principal points, I waived my preferences.

Investigator Commons next had, at Madison, the three months from Feb. 10, 1906, when he parted with me in Pittsburg, until toward the end of May, when he started for Europe, to lay his plans for manœuvring to counterbalance our sure discrediting of the American municipal undertakings we had seen and probably of those we were yet to see. The movement for municipal ownership meantime was active in many parts of the country. He may at this time have got hold of some of the talk about the companies that the next winter he embodied in his additions to our report as his own discoveries. Or, in the autumn, while during my own trip I kept sending him additional bad accounts regarding the American municipal undertakings, the resultant panic may have brought him to seek information from the powerful news bureaus in various cities of the national leaders of municipalism. In any case, considering Investigator Commons' grade of veracity to be what we now know it, evidence more convincing than his word is necessary to win belief that, by accident, he enjoyed, in just the cities concerned, an intimacy with the only men who could impart to him, confidentially, a series of remarkable stories of political bribery and other malfeasance in which they themselves were first among the guilty parties. That in large part he already had his cards up his sleeve when he proposed in London I should visit the American cities alone is highly probable.

In preparing what I wrote of our American report in Madison I cited by name my authorities on points that might be justly considered beyond our certain knowledge. For example, I gave, with their permission, the names of the responsible persons at the Syracuse, Wheeling and Allegheny works who described the political undoing of those undertakings. To this candor Investigator Commons objected. His position was that the authors of the report should stand responsible for its contents. I brought to his attention statements that might arouse the reader's doubts, or give rise to controversy, or be modified by us ourselves on familiar knowledge. Whatever was obvious and unquestionable should be ours; but on important debatable matters the reader was entitled to his own judgment on the authorities. We as investigators should halt at the borders of possible non-fact. Investigator Commons insisted that our writing should be *ex cathedra*. He had his own reasons. He was coming to a part of his work where he couldn't publish his authorities.

It is clear at the present time that Investigator Commons' returns against undertakings not on our list, gathered from backstairs sources, ought to have been rejected by the Committee of Five. This I ought to have insisted upon. The companies did not fall within our inquiry. The undertakings named by the Five were all that the experts or the labor investigators were to report upon. The chairman of the Five at its sessions time and again warmly advocated a restriction of the inquiry to the questions of the schedule and queries directly arising therefrom. "No hot air!" was his admonition. No wandering all over town and country to

make points for or against. As I pushed along on my mission, without a single tip from any source as to what wrong was to be found at the municipal undertakings, advancing from the slight and perhaps inadvertent admissions of a subordinate to the full story of machine rule and exploitation of a city administrative bureau given me by perhaps the tenth official I interviewed, it never occurred to me that whispered stories of wholly different forms of public wrongdoing in the legislative departments of the same municipalities might serve to lessen the proof that municipal operation of productive enterprises had been found to be economically unsound and a permanent opportunity for public spoliation. The information I gathered, open for revision by my colleague and all the Commissioners, stands in contrast with Investigator Commons' easily manufactured revelations, the sources of which are yet shrouded in mystery. In admitting any portion of his barroom lore and reproductions of newspaper political campaign froth to our joint report the Five erred. I myself should have cut away from every word of it and ended my cherished plan of a joint report. My experience in this case has shown me that even the facts of the addition table may be distorted by an observer cranked with the mental twist of a fanatic.

SOME REJECTED TESTIMONY—UNITED STATES.

Investigator Commons rejected from our joint report the following interviews and other passages, which were in my typewritten manuscript just as here printed. He said some of them were not admissible as within the range of the facts we were seeking; others he omitted in rewriting the parts of my manuscript he found necessary to reconstruct after his visits to the American undertakings following mine. I had regarded the points thus brought out by me worth printing if authorities were given:

"Secretary Schenck [Wheeling municipal gas works] said to the investigator, who wrote down the statement in his presence: 'The municipal gas works in Wheeling are a dead failure. The works themselves are in a dilapidated condition, and the management is wholly political. I do not care to hold my place, as it is difficult to be honest in it. A man at the works if discharged for unfitness can be reinstated the same day if he has a pull. Wages have been run up by the politicians in consequence of the demands of the little crowds of the hands joining for political purposes. The works are in a poor state in every way. I'm so disgusted with the political side of my job that I'm ready to throw it up now, though I have fifteen months to serve out my term.'"

"In July, 1906, the [Wheeling] chargers were receiving $2 a day and the stokers $1.80. Both classes demanded an advance of 40 cents a day. The events that ensued were thus described by a colleague of Secretary Schenck, the works Superintendent: 'Those hottest for a strike were made committeemen. First they went to the Council, which referred them to the Gas Trustees, who asked advice of the City Solicitor, getting the reply that they had no right to increase wages. The Council, both First and Second Branches, with the Gas Board, offered 20 cents as a compromise. Next day the men struck, but that night accepted 25 cents as the advance and went back to work.' 'Politics,' continued the Superintendent, 'has

a whole lot to do with the works. The men get out among Councilmen who don't want their ill will and consequently agitate for them. Of course, a private concern could get the work done for much less.'"

"C. H. Watkins, ex-City Clerk, Wheeling (an aged veteran soldier, retired from public life, well spoken of by all who mentioned him): 'The gas works are steadily going down. Politics governs the water works, public works and gas works. When in office I paid $100 political assessment. All the officeholders pay it. I retired in disgust from politics. When I was at the court house the gas works were in the hands of politicians.'"

[In Syracuse.] "James Horton, secretary of the District Council, Brotherhood of Carpenters, made complaint that not one of the men in the water works bureau was a unionist, and that the only way for a wage worker to get a job was through political influence. . . . Men in every city department at the present time have sinecures through political influence. The work contracted for is done under union conditions only when the union itself establishes them."

"A union officer explained that he was not encouraged to help in a change in administration inasmuch as when J. B. Kline was elected Mayor he discharged sixty laborers for economy's sake, but raised salaries in the office by a considerable percentage."

[In Chicago.] "An official of Union No. 134, Electrical Workers (interior wiremen), said he preferred to deal with companies rather than the city. His opinion, as expressed, was that 'in spite of civil service they'll get your scalp.' He regarded the City Hall regulations as to time-checking over-exacting, and thought the changing of Commissioners affected the positions of the rank and file, if not as to security of position, in permanency of location while at work, or other lesser points. . . . The Financial Secretary of Steam Engineers, No. 3, when interviewed, spoke of abuses under former administrations which operated to the disadvantage of his union members, especially men in the lake cribs. While the water bureau paid more than the scale, the Fire Department paid less. His union was obliged to fight the city to obtain union observances. He concluded: 'We use more or less political influence.' The Secretary of the Stationary Firemen said: 'We go before the Finance Committee (which makes up the appropriations) and tell them: "These are our rates,"' and they are politicians and know what to do."

[In Allegheny.] "Ex-Engineer Williams asked the investigator to write this down: 'I am resolved never again to hold any position in a municipal plant.'"

"At the power station office an employee said to the investigator: 'It would be the grandest thing in the world if politics could be kept out of municipal ownership.' Mr. Williams' comment on this was: 'He's the man who when I was ousted by politics took my place through politics.'"

"Robert Dilworth, City Clerk, while being asked for some data by the investigator, remarked on the subject: 'The city can do nothing as cheaply and well as private enterprise. Political bosses really run the bureaus of this city.'"

"The President of the Atlanta Gas Company, speaking of the

conditions under which men might get places and keep them with his corporation, said: 'The employees of the company are concerned only as to their merits in the eyes of their employers; they get their places without political influence and hold them regardless of changes in administration. The interests of retailers or other business men do not curtail their work.' "

"The Atlanta gas-works officials, in all departments, said that in case of a vacancy to be filled by a white man or boy there arose with the company no other question than competency and character. The employees had no concern but to do their work well."

"The Atlanta trade union leaders had no special criticism to make of the company. One union official thought that if it were to pay $2 a day it could get white men for retort house work."

"The South Norwalk works are of about the same type, with respect to labor employment, as ninety-three per cent of the 1,041 municipal electric plants in existence in the United States in March, 1906,—of this total 160 being in villages of less than 1,000 in population and 808 in towns of between 1,000 and 10,000. . . . The members of the local union, recognizing that these municipal employees are not actively underbidding them in the labor market, permit the works to occupy unmolested the position of—in the words of the superintendent—an 'independent institution'—a peaceful haven lying out of the swift current in which the large modern companies move. . . . Illustration of the differences necessarily arising between labor conditions in the municipal plants of small places and those which are in the category of large industries may be found in some slight comparison between the South Norwalk and the Allegheny, Detroit, and Chicago public electric works. These three latter, which have been investigated by our Commission, are among the twelve municipal undertakings in cities of the United States having more than 40,000 inhabitants. In each of the three the trade union had asserted itself. In Allegheny, for instance, according to the testimony of the ex-Assistant Superintendent, the local electrical workers' union prevents political assessments on its members. In Detroit, years ago, the trimmers went on strike, were defeated, and now most of the force work as non-unionists. In Chicago, the union's representatives wait yearly on the City Electrician to have its scale signed. There is no union recognition of these as 'independent institutions.' "

From my notes I gave Investigator Commons the following brief quotations from interviews:

J. H. Gilmour, of Hamilton, Scotland, Fraternal Delegate to the American Federation of Labor from the British trade unions, was with me when, by questioning, I obtained from E. H. Williams, civil engineer of the Allegheny municipal electric works, his first admissions as to the disgraceful political situation there. Investigator Commons, who was with us at the beginning of the conversation, soon walked away, to speak to the Superintendent about some statistical tables. When we left Mr. Williams, who had given the political aspect of municipal ownership anything but an attractive appearance, Mr. Gilmour said: "I have learned more in the last hour about the deplorable possibilities of municipal ownership in America than I ever got from all other sources before. I am sure that the usual arguments for municipal ownership do not apply

where political conditions are such as described by this official of the works. Your first municipal problem in America is evidently purification. When you get that you may start on a new basis."

An employee of the Richmond municipal gas-works said: "Our business methods in the gas department are bad. The connection between the financial and works branches is unsettled. We simply move through a routine, and make no effort to build up a good business. The hardware merchants prevent us from selling gas stoves. We can't fix a rental, like the electric light company, on our own unused fixtures in a house. Any consumer can start a howl that will tell against us, and we have no protection. We have little encouragement to do good work. The public doesn't know anything about the gas department; most people don't know where the works are. They have no interest in the employees; the gas committee changes; the City Councilmen don't generally know the charter provision governing the city gas undertaking."

In every case these views or experiences, coming from men in daily touch with municipal ownership, embodied summaries of vital points, given with positive definiteness. But they were misfits for a report built on the pedagogic plan. They told, however, just what the average inquirer is anxious to know, at the very outset of his looking into the subject. "What are the wise ones saying who have been through the mill?" he asks. And then in approaching his own conclusions on what further data reach him he feels that he moves in a pathway well lighted.

REJECTED TESTIMONY—GREAT BRITAIN.

From Great Britain—of the same import as the previous chapter. Interviews I obtained indicating the dangers of municipalization, especially to the integrity of unions and unionists:

[Notes from several interviews]:

"James Dalrymple, General Manager, Glasgow Tramways: Favors disfranchising public servants; never votes himself; does not permit his employees to be active in politics (municipal); regards the Municipal Employees' Association as 'mischievous'; believes in and supports trade unions. The Glasgow tramway service is 'open shop.' The management follows the market rate of wages; when a joiners' strike in Glasgow recently failed, the corporation service reduced the wages of its joiners ½d. an hour, though its men had not taken part in the strike."

"'A shrewd Secretary of the M. E. A., a man big enough for the purpose, could do much toward making the Glasgow municipal employees a political force; here is possibly a menace.'"

"'Councilmen constantly recommend men for work; the manager exercises his own judgment; individual Councilmen will recommend what collectively the Council reject; individual Councilmen have voted contrary to their opinions to please their constituents.'"

"'The power of discharge and appointment rests only in the General Manager; dismissal follows one charge for drunkenness, when proven; a weak manager would soon bring the service to ruin.'"

"'The public, especially the workingmen, exert a pressure for the reduction of fares; a demand for it is made for political effect.'"

Investigator Commons gives it as a fact (page 104) that in all the British municipal undertakings, except in Liverpool, the attitude of the managers was favorable to union men. Yet he knew that Superintendent Alexander Wilson, gas, Glasgow, had said, in response to a question: "We do not recognize any union; a man is a man to us," and that there had been a strike at the Glasgow gas-works—causes sufficient for him to put the undertaking in the "hostile" class had it belonged to a company.

Richard Davies, then the Scottish District Organizer, Municipal Employees, told us: "The influence of Councilmen in getting jobs is a known fact."

In a debate at the Glasgow Council meeting, Thursday, April 5, 1906, on a proposition to enact that all city employees be engaged through the Municipal Labor Bureau, the following were among the utterances of Labor Councilmen:

"Councillor Battersby: 'It is the prevailing impression that in Glasgow there is no chance to get employment without the recommendation of a town Councillor. This is the painful experience of a Councillor. The Labor Bureau was established for the express purpose of extending aid to those seeking employment, but not one in 100 are placed through the Bureau. This notorious fact of ignoring the Labor Bureau offends the sense of justice in the outside mind.'

"Bailie Stewart: 'The idea prevails that a man cannot get a job without influence. We ought to know the number of men who are registered at the Labor Bureau who are not employed. We could have in a few months a record of the men registering.'

"Bailie Stevenson: 'In the abstract the motion is good and right, but the employment of those registered should be preferential and not compulsory.'

"The ex-Treasurer: 'The friends of foremen and officials get a preference.'

"Bailie Forsyth: 'This motion would cover the whole of the corporation employment. Promotion comes in cases from outside influence, while the lads in the offices are not promoted." [Employment from a certain commercial school.]

"[Glasgow Corporation has no civil service.]"

In an interview at which Investigator Commons was present, R. Toller, 35 Ruskin Buildings, Corporation Street, Birmingham, Secretary Amalgamated Gas Workers, Brickmakers and General Laborers' Society, said:

" 'If the men at the Corporation Gas Works in Birmingham did not organize the Corporation would not increase wages or give good hours. We deal with the Corporation as we would with a private employer. Some of the Councillors, who are business men, might pay the lowest wages if we did not organize and defend ourselves.'

" 'There is difficulty in organizing men in fairly good positions and holding them. They will organize to get an increase, but the difficulty is after we get the increase to keep the men in the line.' "

"Editor Kirk, of 'Dart,' Birmingham: 'Speaking of Birmingham, I say that members of the Council do not give the attention to the gas undertaking that would be given by the directors of a company. They trust to the officials. Municipal trading creates an immense army of officials. The gas employees here have more

than once forced the Council to raise their pay. When municipalization of electricity was talked of here shrewd people started an electric enterprise and sold high to the city.' "

"Pete Curran [now M. P., National Organizer]: 'The organization is rather indifferent in Glasgow and Leicester [municipal gas workers]. The men after getting a remedy for their grievances clear out of the union.' "

"James Holmes, Trustee, at the general offices of the Amalgamated Hosiery Union, Leicester, said: 'As an ex-member of the Leicester town Council I know that workmen get work on the Corporation through the influence of labor and other Councillors. Applicants must have the backing of Councillors and others. In fact, many workmen vote for labor men in hope of getting work, and the candidate has encouraged this hope of getting work when seeking the workman's vote. And if the hoped for work is not found, men have said, "When are you going to get us a job?" "What did we elect you for, if not to get work?" and, "If you do not get us jobs we shall not vote for you again." This is the danger existent to-day, and is a serious portent of the future. Behind the scenes and under the surface a great deal of this goes on. Few are free to state these facts, for most are either seeking a place on Council or Parliament, and are dependent of the votes of workmen as they are the numbers, and if the facts were mentioned they would lose votes and place. The broad spirt of freedom no more exists among the masses than among the classes. I was a member of the Gas, Highway, Sanitary Watch, and Estate Committees, and had some experience of these things. Workmen to-day could be employed at 20 per cent less than is now paid in the open market, but the restrictive influence of the unions in a protective manner acting on the Council raise the wages at least this amount.

" 'In Britain the unions have been legalized as trade unions, as voluntary associations in restraint of trade, and have discarded the voluntary principle, and have become political associations, and trading associations, with about £1,000,000 invested at profit and interest. The effect of the election is to check the organizing of members, as men are being taught to look to Parliament instead of unions as the unions have failed to gain the social efforts aimed at. Trade unions are declining as an economic force, and are emerging into a revolutionary political force, becoming separated from the scientific basis of truth, individual right and social justice.' "

"Councillor A. J. Bailey, 55 Burngreave Road, Sheffield, Secretary, National Amalgamated Union of Labor, interviewed Wednesday, June 13, at his office in his residence:

" 'I am bound to recognize the weaknesses of municipalizing. In some respects the consequences of political action are deplorable. You can only build up your union for the time that labor does not hold political sway. And when an undertaking is municipalized and the wages and conditions of labor improved by labor politicians, the employees tend uniformly to drop out of the union. That was the case in Leicester. Our members do the same with me. I got the corporation gas employees an advance of 3d. a day through arbitration at Rotherham (near Sheffield), and they immediately dropped out. They are not in a position to help themselves or anyone else at this moment. Had they worked by union methods they

would be in the union to-day and enjoying further advantages.

" 'Tramway men in Sheffield are wearing a union button, while at work, without asking permission, and threaten to strike for the right. The movement is due to Socialist agitation. It is a subversion of discipline. A political organization and not a trade union is attempting to run the matter. Nothing is to be gained by it. Discipline must be maintained in the municipal undertaking as in the limited company.

" 'For some years the cry has been "The ballot box," "Trade unionism is played out," "Eight hours a day by legal enactment," "Wages by law"!

" 'The Independent Labor Party has thirty men in the House of Commons. They make a great noise about doing something for labor by legal enactment, and this has a tendency to lead workmen to believe that trade union methods are antiquated. The unskilled are holding back from organizing except the union is run as a political organization. Trade union organizing is not advancing at the rate it ought in England.

" 'A corporation plays quite as prominent a part in keeping wages down as keeping wages up. A Councillor who has some supporters not up to the standard of average workmen gives them notes to managers of department. The Councillor who has recommended a supporter who as a business man he would not employ, will allow a rate of wages to be fixed for him at the value not of a good man, but of that of the inferior man recommended.

" 'In a corporation [municipality] a certain percentage of political hangers on must get jobs. In the Council I sometimes say, "If this were a limited company, *this* could not happen." It would be easier to pad payrolls in a municipality by inferior men than in a private company.

" 'If in America you could limit monopolies as we have done the gas companies in this country you would do the work properly. Instance: the Sheffield Gas Light and Coke Company.

" 'I have observed that under corporations the tendency is for salary pay to go up while wages pay goes down, except in cases where the workmen are thoroughly organized in a strong trade union.

" 'But, notwithstanding these trivial drawbacks, I am a *strong* believer in municipalization and a supporter of municipal undertakings.' "

The basis of the foregoing matter from Councillor Bailey was my notes, taken on the spot, of certain statements he made in this interview with him at Sheffield. These I had typewritten in London more than a month afterward, and sent to him. He returned them, with corrections and additions; what is here printed, unaltered, is from his corrected copy. The most notable addition was the last paragraph. Investigator Commons, to whom I had given a copy, had meantime drawn his attention to how he had "put his foot in it." He threw a somersault to get himself in the required attitude before the municipalization advocates. His long list of "deplorable consequences" had become "trivial drawbacks."

A similar acrobatic feat was apparently performed by the Glasgow Labor Councillors, whose words I quote above. This was done when Investigator Commons went back to Glasgow alone and man-

aged to get the explanations of their remarks he prints, Vol. II, Part II, page 21.

But Trustee Holmes could not be shaken. He had said what he meant. Neither could Organizer Davies.

In London I had many interviews with Labor County Councillors and Members of Parliament, in which they dwelt upon the seamy side of municipalization and the possible injury to result from the British trade union trend at that time toward Socialism. I ceased to enter such matter in my notebooks; it was common talk. Investigator Commons regarded any record of observers' views that foreshadowed consequences, or any assemblage of facts that pointed to a reversal of the political policies of British unions, as lying outside our errand. Labor representatives themselves were cautious in talking of the pitfalls encountered in mingling unionism and politics. They would at times ask not to be quoted. I had seen nothing of this circumspection when in Great Britain ten years before. Its trade union circles were then, as are America's now, characterized by a courageous frankness in the utterance of sentiments. "Hunting cover" was an uncultivated art. But here were members of the very same group of men, perplexed as political trade unionist officeholders, "afraid of their horses." I quote a passage I wrote in Madison, October, 1906, on this situation for the joint report; Investigator Commons, in declining to accept it, rather regarded this record of a serio-comic state of facts as out of place in sober, heavy report carpentering:

"Repeatedly in the course of this investigtion in Great Britain and the United States, the present writer (J. W. Sullivan) has listened to statements either by Councilmen or union officials regarding which the makers afterward desired to hedge or even enter contradictions. If the investigator had made memoranda simply of the vital statements of the speaker's talk, his notes were later on criticised as 'scrappy' or not taking into account why the speaker was 'putting his case strongly.' [Glasgow.] If he set out to write the substance of an interview on the spot, the man interviewed would call his attention to the danger of giving offense to one or another officeholder, to the possible ultimate detriment of a union official. 'I don't want this to come back on me,' would be said. Desiring to get at facts irrespective of bias, the investigator would at times find that his informant was merely echoing the claims of a [political] party. Thereat would rise the query whether the labor representative was working politics for labor, or working labor for a party, or merely was looking out for the furtherance of his own fortunes."

The pith and point of the matter in the last two chapters will doubtless affect the mind of the general reader, and especially of the trade unionist, as deeply as anything occupying similar space in our joint report. Quotations from participants in a movement embodying the gist of their experiences, and approved by them after reflection, as are the foregoing, strike home, as well directed shots reach the bull's eye of a target.

COMPARATIVE CIVIC PURITY.

No evidence whatever was produced by our Commission's pro-municipalist investigators that Councils in British anti-municipalist cities are of a lower grade than in cities much municipalized. And

as to the assumed surpassing purity and efficiency of British government administration compared with the results of our democracy, some reflection is due.

I.

While Investigator Commons was finding the Sheffield and Newcastle-on-Tyne Town Councils guilty of inferiority to other Town Councils, without giving a single fact on which to base his judgment, he had had through me sufficient criticisms of the Council in Glasgow from its own citizens to raise a question as to the solid block of virtues with which it was accredited by certain members of our Commission.

It was, in fact, instructive to me, on my pioneer visit alone to Glasgow, to see how little free from political bickerings that paragon city of the municipalists is, as well as how often imputations of seeking selfish ends were cast upon many of the city fathers. I had before me, as in a set of moving pictures, the onslaughts and mêlées of the hotly contending municipal factions of a big American city. The combatants were calling one another the same names, accusing one another of the same human failings, as we are accustomed to hearing at home in cities not our best.

The charges of favoritism in appointments made at the Council session I attended had the familiar sound of the same charge so often heard in American Council chambers. But I was hardly prepared for the positive denials made on other questions to direct assertions regarding what were ascertainable facts, one way or the other. The leader of the opposition declared that tramway street rectifications, naming one of the streets, had not been charged to the tramways department; the convenor (chairman) of the Tramways Committee flatly contradicted the statement. Lively interruptions of a speaker continually imparted a hilariousness or a wave of indignation in the meeting. One Councillor, badgered by opponents, refused to proceed in speaking, and took his seat. An opponent taunted him with simulating martyrdom. From beginning to end the session was spicy.

The city officials I met talked little before me about one another, but among other men I met then and since I observed a liberality in affirming shortcomings in public places satisfactory to any Englishman critical of the Scotch.

There's ample work yet for the public purifier in Glasgow.

That city is laughing yet at a Town Councillor who is a hatter who had to apologize in the press for putting the name and label of a high-class firm in a hat of his own inferior make. The community suffered a blow in its pride when, in recent years, its treasurer pleaded guilty to embezzlement and took five years' penalty without trial. To believe everyday street rumor and the published assertions of some of the reformers, the licensing of public houses by the Bailies (Aldermen) is attended by crude forms of bribery in ways great and small. A Bailie connected with a housepainting firm will get the job of painting the hotel from which his influence might take away the license—type of a series of stories imaginable from the situation. And that something is fundamentally wrong in the municipality's management of the liquor traffic is scandalously evident in the frightful horrors of Glasgow's streets after nightfall, unparalleled in their degradation in any other city I saw in Great

Britain and undreamed of in the poorest sections of New York.

The tricks commonly attributed to Tammany by our reformers, but which are known generally to municipal machines, are played in Glasgow. "Quite recently," says a pamphlet arraigning the city government, "a corporation (municipal) advertisement was withheld from a local paper because the paper had ventured to criticise a certain department." Again: "Municipal employees, from the highest to the lowest, are consciously and unconsciously becoming a municipal caste." A business man, active in organizations fighting municipalism, cannot obtain a city contract, if what I was more than once assured is correct. His name is struck off the contractors' list.

In the Council's business, according to the Glasgow News, "a certain laxity of method has been prevalent which might very easily lead to serious abuses." This journal gives an example in which, after the Council had passed a bill, one of its clauses, relating to compensation, had been altered. In another case a committee added a new clause. It is not concealed in Glasgow that the electricity department exists under the sufferance of the gas department, with the consequent withering of the local electrical industry.

Factious organizations in the dominant element strive to influence the local elections. There is an Irish Municipal Committee, a Corporation Workers' Union, a Co-operative Municipal Election Committee, an Independent Labor Party Committee, and a Glasgow Central Liberal Association, "to secure the return of Liberal representatives to all local boards." Good game, hunters aplenty.

"Glasgow's municipal enterprises have nearly abolished taxation," was a bit of news going the rounds of the municipal ownership press of America two years ago. By the official reports, the Glasgow municipal debt is now £14,986,400, against £9,049,065 in 1898; the total of rates and taxes, 8s. 3d. on the pound, against 4s. 11d. in 1890; the total of assessments, for municipal purposes only, £911,484, against £628,789 in 1898. The problem of municipal tenements is at present complicated, with 15,069 houses unoccupied, out of a total of 163,427.

Five years ago the Ratepayers' Federation began exposing the unsatisfactory auditing of Glasgow's accounts. More recently it entered suit to prevent the city from expending money in the promotion of a land values taxation bill in Parliament. On both these issues the municipality has (June, 1908) surrendered, after a costly litigation. The auditing methods recommended by the Ratepayers' Association have been adopted; the inroads on the Common Good must be stopped; the expenditure in promoting the taxation of land values bill has ceased, as illegal. Of the £2,457 spent £1,685 was got back from other municipalities.

As is generally the case in Great Britain, the bookkeeping of the general city accounts in connection with the municipal undertakings accounts have resulted in Glasgow in a wide disbelief in the soundness of the city's methods. While the current receipts and expenditures of an undertaking in any single year may be correctly set forth, questions of interest, renewals, depreciation, and sums properly chargeable to original cost, to street improvements, and to general municipal administration leave it undetermined as to what

really is the financial condition of the undertaking. On July 10, 1908, for example, the leading editorial in the Glasgow "Herald" began: "Yesterday the corporation [Town Council] treated itself to what might be described as at least a half dress debate upon the disposal of the tramway surplus—a discussion which must provide considerable amusement for those critics of municipal accounting who hold, as we do, that there is not yet any palpable surplus to divide."

The Citizens' Union deplores the lack of co-ordination of Glasgow's municipal departments; "Their heads are colonels, and there is no general." A leading lawyer states publicly that the local law is a labyrinth. The enormously increased duties of Councillors with the rapid municipalization of various enterprises serves to keep busy citizens out of the Council. The petty graft of Councillors of small calibre—such as running up questionable hotel bills while travelling, going third class and charging up first class fares—keeps gossip of possibly greater underhand graft alive.

All is not smooth and "superior" in Glasgow's municipal affairs. A local scribe, noting its difficulties, speaks of the city's "litigation, annexation, confiscation, federation, consolidation, municipalization, street registration, land values taxation." Each of these polysyllables designates a public bone of contention or a municipal disaster, such as the telephone fiasco.

II.

One of the men most prominently in view in London when our Commission was in that city was Mr. T. McKinnon Wood. When he appeared at one of our sessions he was introduced by Robert Donald, Editor of the Daily Chronicle, as the leader of the Progressives in the London County Council. There was no doubt that he occupied that position. He led the Progressive side in the debate in the Council; he was at one time chairman of the body; he appeared before committees of the House of Commons on behalf of the Council; his name as leader was in the newspapers every day.

But something happened to him a year ago. It forms a story which in New York would be rehearsed by the newspapers endlessly to a public man's disadvantage. In England, however, matters affecting private character may be printed immediately in connection with public proceedings, but are not to be dilated upon afterward. So nothing comes out in the newspapers at the present time in relation to this episode in which Mr. Wood figured, though his friends and his opponents whisper of the damage his reputation has suffered through its developments.

Some one, in February, 1907, called the attention of the Westminster City Council (London has two "cities" and twenty-eight boroughs, each with a Council), to the fact that a "cellar flap" (street cellar door) had been set in the public way in front of the premises of J. J. Griffin & Sons, scientific instrument makers, Kean street, Kingsway. As permission for this cellar-flap had been refused by the Council, it set up an inquiry. The London County Council replied, in response to a communication, that plans of pavement lights were approved by it in December, 1904, and as the only departure from the plans in this case was that one of the lights had been hinged so as to act as a cellar-flap, the Council would take no

proceedings. The Westminster City Council thereupon protested against the exceptional treatment accorded to Messrs. J. J. Griffin & Sons. In printing a report of these proceedings the Daily Mail asked, "Who are Messrs. J. J. Griffin & Sons?" The Financial News, in reply, printed a three-column article which showed that J. J. Griffin & Sons, contractors for the London County Council, were, to the extent of nearly 50 per cent, Mr. T. McKinnon Wood. The leader of the Progressives had bought shares in the company in 1899, and became a director in 1900. In 1905 he was in all possessed of 4,247 shares out of 9,990 and the ten founders' shares.

Some one with a memory now recalled that Messrs. J. J. Griffin had been formerly on premises which had been demolished in making the great Holborn-to-Strand improvement, the new broad, central street of which became Kingsway. The relevant documents looked up, it came out that Messrs. J. J. Griffin & Son, in lieu of their leasehold in the premises demolished, had been given by the London County Council a lease for fifty years of a site equal in area to that abandoned, at the same rental, together with £16,000 cash compensation!

A sub-committee of the London County Council investigated the connection of Mr. Wood with the Griffin firm. It reported, Feb. 25, that from 1889 to 1897 various schemes before the Council for the Holborn-to-Strand improvement were rejected, and that the one proposed in 1896, by which the Griffin leasehold premises were to be taken, was abandoned, and that Mr. Wood voted against all these schemes. Further, in 1897 the Improvements Committee had devoted its attention to a scheme that would have avoided the street on which the Griffin premises were situated. To the point that had been raised that the Griffin firm had moved from a side street into the premises demolished when it was known they might be taken for the improvement, the sub-committee said there was nothing that would justify them in assuming that any other than business considerations actuated the firm to so remove. In 1897 its sales were four times as much as in 1890, and in 1907 three times those of 1897. The staff increased from 35 in 1897 to 138 in 1906. "There was no doubt," the committee said, "that in the year 1898 Mr. Wood (who was then chairman of the Council) was aware that the [Griffin] site would be taken." "The question for us is whether he took steps to inform the Council of his interest in the property," though at that time there was no legal obligation, as there now is, upon a member to disclose his interest in a question before the Council. The committee found three members to whom Mr. Wood had mentioned his interest in the firm, but the Clerk of the Council from 1896 to 1900 never had the matter brought to his knowledge. As to the Griffin Council contracts, the committee reported that in number they were considerably more than other firms obtained—but as a rule they supplied the cheapest article and were in a better position to supply certain apparatus than some of their competitors. And thus the committee somewhat perfunctorily recited a set of facts that on their face lessened the showing against Mr. Wood, who had already made his explanations in the daily press.

A correspondent of the Morning Advertiser, Feb. 12, had, however, with particulars as to dates, quoted from the records to show that the Holborn-to-Strand scheme adopted in 1898 had differed

from that recommended in 1892, and again in 1895, in only one important point, a bifurcation at the southern end of the great new street, in no wise affecting the Griffin site. The disturbance of this site was contemplated by the Improvements Committee from year to year. Mr. T. McKinnon Wood, as chairman of the Council, attended as an ex-officio member 23 of the 36 sessions in 1898 of the Improvements Committee, which, on July 5, when Mr. Wood was in the chair, unanimously decided that the best scheme was that recommended by the same committee in 1892 and 1896. The Morning Advertiser's correspondent concludes, after a column of citations from Council and Committee proceedings: "It was impossible, therefore, that any county Councillor could have gone into Sardinia street [to the Griffin site] without being aware that he was on the line of improvement, which must be scheduled under the recoupment scheme."

I heard professed two sets of opinions on this case in London. Some cautious and closely interested observers hold that the Committee's report absolved Mr. Wood. Otherwise, plain spoken citizens, just as deeply interested, maintained that he is discredited, even with his own associates in private, and that his useful career is ended, as time will show. The cellar-flap privilege, the great increase in the business of Griffin & Sons, the compensation, the public ignorance that Mr. Wood was so much also Griffin & Sons, here is circumstantial evidence most disturbing.

In that land of keeping mum on anti-patriotic topics, partly through national habit and partly through terrors of the law, the matter is barred from public discussion. But its echoes would still from time to time call forth black headlines in the evening papers had the event occurred in New York. America would have one more occasion to hang her head for "the shame of her cities." And had Investigator Commons found any such case among the Moderate or Labor-Liberal Councillors of Sheffield or Newcastle-upon-Tyne, he would have made the most of this bit of testimony to generalize on the "inferiority" of the Councils of these two cities. But he never produced one word of any testimony of the kind. He could not.

III.

Illustrative of accepting appearances as the solid background of fact is the impression somewhat prevalent among tourist Americans that government in Great Britain, municipal or general, shows little trace of the flaws they hear so loudly decried at home. But the American observer who tarries awhile and takes note is awakened first to the fact that current political happenings at times tell a familiar tale, and secondly, to the truth that where we blab and re-thrash public scandals the British method prescribes a short story and a long silence.

Occasionally some of the remarks of newspaper editors and correspondents go far to lift the curtain to the visiting American. A Yarmouth man writes to a London daily newspaper: "From knowledge gained from forty years' insight into the municipal and parliamentary life of this town, I unhesitatingly state that our local government is rotten to the core. Open bribery has been practiced on both sides, and open treating at municipal and parochial contests. The landlord holds the whip over the tenant; the employer

coerces the employee; the customer boycotts the tradesman."

After Kidderminster returned to Parliament a Liberal, many of the wealthy men of the district, mostly manufacturers, refused to renew their subscriptions to the benevolent funds of the Carpet Weavers' Association, with its staunch Liberal vote. A candidate may subscribe to a local cricket club, local charities, or local amusements, to gain popularity, or refuse to subscribe when not paid back in popularity on election day. Said a Member of Parliament to me who had lived in New York: "American politicians carry on their doings before the curtain; ours know what part of the play should go on when the curtain is down."

The London borough scandals have had their airing in the American press:—West Ham, with its workhouse bedroom suite that cost $250; Poplar, with its poor rate in 1907 just double that of 1891; others, with their unusual expense accounts for Mayor and Councillors, their petty grafts of handsome pocketbooks for Council members and friends. The small peculations in boroughs, however, pale before their egregious business blunders. Marylebone decided to take in hand its own electric lighting; the law required that it must buy out the local company, which offered to sell for $4,500,000. The Council rejected the price, went to law over it, spent $300,000 on attorneys and costs, and in the end paid $6,000,000.

The consequences of British governmental incapacity are described in the London press in the same headlines as we see used for the same chronic difficulties in America: "Discarded War Stores Resold to the Army at Great Profit!" "Strong Condemnation of London Food Factories!" "Nation's Printing Bill; Great Waste on Useless Documents." "The Adulterations of Butter."

The predatory political machine in Great Britain has been limited by opportunity. The hoodlum masses can't be bought cheap because as empty sacks they have no vote. The only elective officeholders are members of the Councils and of Parliament, unpaid. The octopus landlords forestall the municipal jobs set up in American suburban districts by shoals of little real estate sharks. The public waste incident to the colossal development of great cities in a rich and prodigal new world is absent. No increase of population of forty-five millions in forty years has scrambled multifarious privileges through legislative bodies to the strong and unscrupulous.

The conditions for exposure and public scandal-mongery are also limited. The British sensational press is bridled by the law. The ten thousand busy and reckless partisan newspaper pens that dirty public reputations in America with impunity would rust in idleness in Great Britain, where with exemplary damages, "The greater the truth the greater is the libel."

As temptation is restricted, purity may rise proportionately. Reputation at times is a sequence of covering up. Seas exist beneath the surface sea.

THE PASSING OF THE MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP FEVER.

In two short years a change has come o'er the spirit of the dreams told by pro-municipal prophets. To look no further than the sphere of the Civic Federation's investigation and questions of close interest to its Commission's membership, we see a steady

movement away from municipal ownership and toward regulation.

The first point to be noted is that in its report to the Commission the Committee of Twenty-One took a position decidedly against the usual propositions for municipal ownership. Not one of the municipal undertakings investigated in the United States had fulfilled all the requirements laid down by the committee for proof of continuous highly successful municipal operation. On examination of these undertakings, which were examples selected by the municipal ownership members of the committee, representative men of the movement found out that what they wanted was usually some other ideal of municipal ownership than that investigated. Of the two most highly creditable examples, one was of the exceptional class of water supply, which may be a failure in the next administration, and the other, an electrical undertaking, of an order too small for a model of sure value to large cities. The minds of observers who had carefully followed the investigation were undoubtedly influenced by the report to pay heed in future to methods of control rather than of ownership.

In Philadelphia, the campaign of the municipal ownership advocates against the renewal for twenty years of the lease of the United Gas Improvement Company failed by a vote of 54 to 22 in Council, which, the "Public Ledger" said, "very fairly represented the preponderance of public opinion on the subject." Consequently until 1927 that city will have gas of the first quality and an admirable service, for which the company, by its figures, receives 73 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The company pays into the city 10 cents out of the $1 per 1,000 paid by the consumer, serves the nearly 30,000 street lamps free, and at the end of the lease turns the entire plant back to the municipality.

In Chicago, the "immediate" municipal ownership movement of the Dunne administration has, under the votings of the community, come to nothing but a regulation that puts possible municipal ownership off to a remote generation.

In Cleveland, Prof. Bemis is figuring for the information of the country how many million dollars have been saved to the community under a three-cent fare through a new private street-car company instead of through lines owned by the city.

In New York, the present summer has witnessed the curtain fall on a sensational municipal campaign farce begun three years ago. In pleading guilty to accepting a bribe and being fined $1,000, one of the eleven Municipal Ownership Aldermen elected in that campaign has set an end to all doubts of the story that the leader of the group, caught in a trap made in a newspaper office, had bargained to sell the eleven votes on the occasion of an official act for $5,500. The shriek of this stamp of municipal reformer has been drowned in a guffaw from New York's amused criminals of all classes.

But the serious work of regulation, led by the Governor of the State, bringing into existence the Public Service Commission, is actually fast converting to its support the mass of men who had spoken of themselves as municipalization advocates. The first annual report of the Commission for Greater New York, just issued, showing its reforms of transportation abuses and service deficiencies, and its prevention of over-capitalization and cut-throat stock-job-

bing competition that would mean eventual combination, has gone far to satisfy the desires for reform of practical opponents of the methods by which certain public utility agencies had plundered the community.

In New York, also, the last municipal electricity plant has gone out of existence.

There is not the slightest probability that any of the private American undertakings investigated by the Civic Federation Commission will be taken over by the municipality which it serves. But there is a probability that any one of the municipal undertakings, except water, may be sold to private agencies by the community by which it is now owned. The author of a work on the subject recently issued gives a list of thirty municipal electric undertakings sold to companies in the fourteen months ending February last, with no transfers conversely.

The present sentiment in the trades union world as to public ownership in general may be indicated by the vote taken at Norfolk last November at the convention of the American Federation of Labor on government ownership of railroads: Delegates for, 50; against, 154.

Two years ago, when the Civic Federation Commission was in Great Britain, a labor member—an enthusiastic municipal ownership man—on one occasion, in the presence of a circle of British unionist Socialists, said to me, not gently: "You can't stand up to-day in a union meeting in the United States and oppose municipal ownership!" If so: Time works its changes. I can to-day.

In Great Britain, during my visit in the spring of this year, the leader of the Municipal Employees' Association said to me: "There's a lull at present in the municipal ownership movement." The same week the Secretary of the London Municipal Reformers informed me: "The pro-municipalists could not to-day initiate any new municipal scheme whatever. That wave is all passed over. The County Council is now trying to find out where it has really left us financially."

This "lull" is everywhere in Britain. The continually rising tide of local taxes, the characters taking a hand in the game of politics, the exultations of the Socialists over municipalist victories, the disappointing outcome of the municipal ventures already made except in undertakings in a few large cities, the utter failures such as the Thames steamboats and municipal telephones, and the evidences of the growing political strength of public employees—these points are more frequently the subjects of comment now than they could possibly have been five years ago at the stage at that time of public experience.

Even in Glasgow, municipal ownership is on the defensive. Its telephone, its housing scheme, its liquor traffic, its increase in rates, its questionable methods of promoting partisan bills in Parliament have brought their reaction.

I found in April in England that prominent trade union men who had been elected to legislative office were by no means disappointed at the recent turn in municipal affairs. They were beginning to speak their mind. "Some partisans," said one of them, referring to the radicals who had been pushing municipalism in the unions, "would cut off free speech." I heard much talk about compelling the Socialists and semi-Socialists to retire to the background.

I asked the tailor ex-Mayor of Battersea who was to be the leader in this uprising in the unions against the extremists. He instantly replied: "John Burns."

The change in twenty years in John Burns' views and activities is parallel to that of many thousands of workingmen in Great Britain who have moved from crude radicalism to opportunism by the political route. Burns, who once waved the red flag and commanded the plaudits of twenty thousand men in a single crowd while in his stentor's voice he proclaimed "the class struggle" and called on the British workers to "take into their own hands the land, machinery, capital, and all means of production," is now retaining the votes of the masses in a course in which he is gradually freeing himself from the network of Socialist and municipal devices that have in practice proved futile. His speeches in Parliament have indicated, as the thermometer does the weather, especially during the last two years, the modification in the tendencies of the British working class voters. His views on the causes of pauperism and the public methods of preventing poverty have undergone a radical change.

On January 30 of the present year, in the House of Commons, the Socialist-Labor members Snowden, Macdonald, and Pete Curran, during a debate on the unemployed problem, taunted Burns with abandoning his old principles. He had recently jeered at proposals "made by doss-house economists and soup-kitchen reformers." In his reply Burns said ("Daily Telegraph"): "Pauperism would continue to grow if the unemployed movement was exploited by the type of persons who came to London not to work but to live on public funds, private charity, and the eleemosynary aid which was intended for better people." "There had never been more nonsense talked about pauperism in Great Britain and Ireland than in the last few years." "The time had come when the provision of pauperizing relief in this country should be arrested, and they [the government] would concentrate themselves on bedrock causes and transient palliatives which would lead to permanent reform. He wanted no more state workshops or municipal expedients, which would accentuate the difficulty and make the remedy worse than the disease."

Burns is up with the procession of English voters. Preponderant working class sentiment has shown at the polls that it will not soon again demand more municipal dwellings and workshops, river steamboats, tramway supply foundries, or any of the class of "municipal expedients" which have had their popularity in the prospect and their disappointment in the fact.

London, which when our Commission visited it two years ago had officially municipal ownership in full swing, has undergone a popular revulsion against it. In the twenty-eight boroughs hardly enough municipal ownership Councillors remain to maintain a discussion. In the London County Council, also, the Socialist-Progressive majority has disappeared, and the opposition is carefully looking into the true financial condition of the municipal ventures so hopefully launched in the heyday of optimistic municipalism. If there was any one scheme which seemed to its supporters certain of great profits it was that of the London County Council tramways. Its outcome to the present time may be taken as a criterion

of the very best that rampant municipalization in London has given to the world. And what actually is the result? At a meeting of our Committee of Twenty-One, at St. Ermin's Hotel, July 3, 1906, to hear leading representatives of the municipal ownership movement in Great Britain, Mr. T. McKinnon Wood said of the County Council's tramways: "The total capital is £4,818,000. This includes the purchase money. The sinking fund is about £450,000. Of the £4,818,000 capital, we have paid off £607,000, and of that £607,000 about £450,000 is sinking fund. We have also put a sum of £290,000 to relief of rates." But, alas! on March 28, 1908, a special report on the tramways, made by the President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants and others, was laid before the County Council. In brief, it showed that the £293,592 that had been applied 1897-1904 in relief of rates ought to have been applied to making up a loss exceeding £1,000,000 overlooked in the Council's methods of bookkeeping on the displacement of the horse traction system. Besides, on "improvements undertaken or proposed in connection with tramway schemes," "a substantial, but as yet unascertained, proportion of £387,438," should have been charged to tramways capital account, whereas it was set down to the general improvement account, and on "improvements for the purpose of general traffic," "a considerable, but as yet unascertained, proportion of £864,121 should also have been charged to tramways capital account." That is, up to March 31, 1907, the London County Council tramways, instead of earning profits of $1,500,000, were anywhere from $4,000,000 to $6,000,000 behind hand on the accounts mentioned, with nearly another million dollars arrearages on renewals and central office charges. Here is one of the fatal flaws in municipal ownership: By an erroneous allocation of costs the general municipal treasury may for a time carry the burden of low fares, blunders, and liberality in general—to come to a disastrous end on a day of judgment literally as sure to arrive as taxation. The fatal flaw of municipalism is in the finances; that is, deficits must be made up by taxes.

A NECESSARY PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

I may now have convinced the reader—(1) that Investigator Commons defied the lightning of truth the day he sought to blast me in my absence; and (2) that in my review I helped to bring out the vices in municipal ownership and operation that on being seen carry public support instead to the principle of control. But this leaves many—perhaps most—of my readers who do not know me still not satisfied on a point regarding myself. However they may have veiled their allusions to the motives of personal interest affecting me, some men I have met have had in mind: "What were you in this investigation for?" "What did you get out of it?" When Investigator Commons told the Civic Federation membership of my acts as investigator and reviewer, which to him were "impossible," he knew well the injury he could thus work me with many among those classed as "of the public" and "of the employers."

Certain candid men, English or American, among the hundreds with whom this work has brought me in contact, have put to me queries indirectly, by comment: "You have a good thing on this Commission." "You'll come out well, with your economical habits."

"In England we hear that American labor men on government or other commissions receive large salaries." "You are in company with big capitalists." "We Labor delegates in England can seldom afford to put up at first-class hotels."

This from the labor column of a New York evening newspaper, after a line to the effect that the labor men of the Twenty-One all had good trade union records: "They should be favorable to public ownership; but I happen to know that some of them are not—why, I am at a loss to understand." And with it a sermon on the evil intent of the capitalists backing the inquiry. A book reviewer in an engineering weekly paper, quoting a part of Investigator Commons' double-edged reluctant personal explanation, admires his "ideals" as therein expressed and lauds his impartiality, but finds that my review, "valuable" from my "being a trade unionist," is only "an argument."

When Investigator Commons and I traveled together in Great Britain I usually found that the second day we were in any city I was being classed by the political unionists as "with the capitalists."

So, to satisfy the last possible query, and to make plain the principle on which I do what public work I can, I shall tell now what I made out of my work for this Commission, and, while on the subject, out of various other tasks as labor representative that I have undertaken. My time of service for labor warrants me in putting an end to my habit of reticence in the matter.

The salaries of the Commission's American engineers and accountants, and of those Commissioners that gave up their regular positions for a time, and of the labor investigators, were placed about the point of their accustomed earnings or a small percentage higher. Mine was put at $200 a month, full time; the United Garment Workers of America paid me $30 a week for getting out their periodical, leaving me a day or two a week free for occasional other earnings. The allowance for hotel and transportation expenses for Commissioners and investigators was $10 a day, except during the ocean passages, which took a special sum apart.

Toward the close of my engagement I drew up a memorandum, copies of which I gave separately to two members of the Civic Federation. As to salary, it showed that within the time of my connection with the Commission I had declined to draw anything for a week at one stage of the work and two months at another, the latter being time I spent in New York, without earnings, waiting for the meeting of the Twenty-One, before returning to Europe, April, 1907. As to expenses, the sums I drew were less than the amount I was entitled to draw by $1,575. These two items of unpaid time and undrawn expenses I had had it in my power to convert into more than $2,000 cash to my account, with no dispute about it. I also paid out of my salary, without rendering bills, my quota of certain extra traveling expenses incurred while with the Commissioners on tour in Great Britain, all my own entertainment bills for labor men and others while interviewing them, the outlay for several trips in America which some of the Commissioners might have deemed not necessary, the unitemizable expenditures for wear and tear and accident in travel, my recent trip to England to interview managers, and the petty expenses connected with the Commission since April 1, 1907. This defence against the attack of

Investigator Commons I print at my own cost, every copy being issued gratuitously.

The expense account I handed in, instead of being made up according to actual outlay or simply by drawing the maximum, as to which all sending in expense bills could exercise their option, was set down at railroad fare and the per diem allowed, not by my own richer typographical union, but by the garment workers. I declined my salary for the months in New York that it might be seen that I was waiting to perform my duty when the Twenty-One met and not to draw money.

After thus waiting from December 1, 1906, until in February, 1907, I was made Secretary of the Committee of Four, and I drew up suggestions for the first drafts of sections of its report. When, as the weeks dragged on, it became evident that months more must elapse before the expected meeting would take place, I resigned this position and went my way. With other work open to me on the Commission, I could have been on salary with it at least six months longer.

My "good thing" therefore has resulted in less—by hundreds of dollars—than I would have earned had I remained with the Garment Workers during the time I was with the Commission.

During the months I was waiting I did some work for the Civic Federation. I assisted in the details of getting up the annual meeting, collected facts of record and interviewed persons in connection with its child labor work, and wrote and delivered an address on its welfare department which was issued in pamphlet form. For these services I declined the pay repeatedly offered me by the Manager.

Just before leaving New York I wrote Investigator Commons the foregoing points in outline.

I have been doing this kind of work, to the extent that I have been able, for a quarter of a century.

When, five years ago, anticipating its sale to a politician, I bought the New York "Unionist," then the semi-official publication of Typographical Union No. 6 (which has seven thousand dues-paying members, its scale being from $21 to $33 a week), every President, or every living representative of the presidency, for more than twenty years wrote that from his personal experience with me he had confidence in my intention to put high character into their little fortnightly craft paper—which, unfortunately, on two occasions had been carried into practical politics. I issued it during a Mayoralty campaign one year and a Presidential campaign the following without mention of politics in either reading or advertising columns. I sold the paper ten months before an election for the same price I had paid for it. Its income I had put into its improvement, its issuance an avocation unrequited by profits. My chief satisfaction was in contributing to the credit of my organization.

I was two years and ten months Chairman-Treasurer (manager) of the printers' farm. One year we had more than ninety members working on park land; the next year sixty-three persons on a farm of 166 acres. Writing afterward, the Secretary-Treasurer of No. 6 said: "I can testify that in the years you were on the

Farm Committee you not only never drew a cent from the union for either salary or expenses, but as Chairman-Treasurer you handed to me, as contributions from outside parties, the sum of $1,500, which went to the support of the farm."

For years I was on one committee or another in this great union—on the out-of-work committee several times, aggregating a year and a half; on special work for families of impoverished members; on investigating the accounts for two strike years, involving the auditing of thousands of receipts and expenditures amounting to more than $100,000, a piece of work taking sixteen weeks of the committeemen's time not given to their regular office work. The union has its scale of allowances for such committee work. I never drew anything.

As Samuel Gompers will testify, while I held in the years 1892-'95 the position of General Lecturer on Initiative and Referendum, American Federation of Labor, traveling much in New England, New York, New Jersey, and to the Pacific Coast, lecturing on the subject, I never drew a dollar from the Federation for salary or expenses. My terms to organizations of all kinds, labor or civic, that paid me at all, were my hotel and transportation bills. I uniformly gave my time for nothing. In numerous cases I paid my own expenses.

I paid my own way when, during four months in Switzerland in 1888, I got up the facts relating to that country in my "Direct Legislation." I gave away thousands of copies of the work. I wrote numerous articles on the question for all sorts of publications, receiving pay for less than a score. I published the early numbers of the "Direct Legislation Record" at a loss of full 50 per cent of its cost. I contributed in cash to the formation of direct legislation leagues.

My services as editor under salary on official labor union organs, in all covering periods summing up four years, have been compensated at union rates. But the years in addition during which I have given my time to the social reform press have yielded me far less—perhaps 25 per cent—than what I have regularly earned while at my occupation on morning newspapers. In 1883-'84 my writing for the popular workingmen's paper of New York was gratuitous; in 1887-'89, as labor editor on the weekly paper which started as a "land and labor" advocate, I voluntarily reduced my salary 20 per cent after a few weeks' work, and it was never restored; as associate editor, 1889-'93, on another social reform weekly, my salary was one-third less than what I immediately drew on going back to proof-reading on a morning daily. In writing articles on labor or politico-economic subjects my rule has been to give outright to struggling publishers and to gauge my bills to others according to their purse and their disposition to let me have my full say. Since I decided, twenty-five years ago, to speak out my conceptions of human justice, I have written nothing I did not wholly believe; but many occasions naturally have arisen when the full expression of my economic faith was not appropriate to the subject in hand.

But—politics? I have never handled a dollar of politicians' money. I have never asked for office or a vote for myself. I have at no time been in politics with either of the great parties. I have

in no instance traded on my connection with the labor movement for votes or any public position whatever.

I was active in New York in 1886-'87 as a member of the United Labor Party. As Treasurer of the Printing Trades Legion of the campaign of 1886 I paid on the wind-up its residuary debts. As Treasurer of the Sixteenth Assembly District up to March, 1888, I took care of its recurring deficits. As Treasurer of the Trade and Labor Conference that submitted demands of organized labor to the State Constitutional Convention in 1893-'94, I financed its current printing and similar bills, the vouchers of which I yet have. As a delegate or committeeman sent frequently to the Albany and Trenton state houses in regard to labor or direct legislation matters, I never received a fee, and, with the exception in making a trip to call a New York Governor's attention to the Labor Bureau's neglect of child labor, always paid my own expenses.

Since the United Labor Party's decline in 1887 I have been active in but one political campaign. When Seth Low ran for Mayor against the two old parties in 1897, attracted by his labor plank and his independence, I did a fair amount of service, without any form of compensation, as the labor committeemen of that year knew. I presided at labor conferences, took off time from my work to address meetings, and wrote a pamphlet published by the campaign committee.

An opening for "a future," made me by friendly politicians of the great parties, has been no rarity. A ladder to climb to the respectful consideration of political managers, put before me by the small parties, has not been wholly unfamiliar. In 1887 the Central Committee of the United Labor Party slated me as candidate for State Senator. In 1892 a committee proffered me the nomination for Mayor on the Populists' ticket, though I opposed much of their platform. In 1897 a place on its county ticket was tendered me by the Low party. All declined.

My theories have brought me to the study, not of the game of politics, but of a political economy as radical as justice.

But, it will be asked, "How could this career be followed by a 'workingman'?"

I have lived the last quarter of a century without anxiety over getting along. First, I have had but one other person to care for, and we are both scrupulously watchful in the management of our outlay. Day compared with day, my salary in the years I have worked as proofreader on a daily newspaper has been more than the average earnings of New York's professional men. Two inheritances, of which I was always sure, if I lived, came to me—one in 1887, one in 1904—in amount not far from $10,000. When, in 1883, I decided to branch out into my own preferred channels of public service I had, as I yet have, health, a knowledge of the printing business that promised a continuous opportunity, prospects for some provision against old age, and the art of making a dollar worth one hundred cents with no waste.

But when I had been nearly ten years following my chosen methods in my own way and with my own means, not long after I began my propaganda for direct legislation, one person convinced me that I could do better work with an assistance that came without terms and that could never result in influencing my freedom in thought or action. That one person, alone, I have permitted to

give me money unearned by hard labor. From the fund thus coming I have drawn to meet a share of the heavier expenses above mentioned, to compensate me in part for time lost from work and on occasions to aid where there was suffering or feeble human endeavor for betterment.

If on reading this statement any three reputable members "on part of the public" or "on part of the employers" in the Civic Federation should wish further particulars, I shall refer them to Samuel Gompers, J. W. Bramwood, and B. A. Larger for decision as to whether their inquiry is made in good faith and is of moment to me or the public, and if these representative labor men should say it is, I'll submit in the matter to every point within the searching power of an attorney or a committee.

It is due those gentlemen of the Commission who are connected with large enterprises to say that not one of them ever uttered in my presence a word tending to influence improperly other members or the investigators in the slightest degree.

I have aimed to convince the reader of the truth of all I have herein written, going on to the last question that men, in their skepticism, usually raise. Investigator Commons' charges and insinuations I could ignore only by leaving the impression with the non-working class members of the Civic Federation, and citizens in general who had read his attack on me, that here possibly was a case of a workingman representative, indifferent to his work as investigator, abandoning his bounden duty of impartiality and acting as counsel for a side that could command a fee. In undertaking to reply to him, I could not leave the controversy until it was exhausted, notwithstanding the tedious work of particularizing and correcting his errors of statement and aberrations of view, and despite my reluctance natural in going into the private matters I have detailed. Because Investigator Commons aimed outrageously to destroy my life work I have been obliged to show what that life work has been.

Never have I written a single line "in support of the capitalists." In opposing the economic blunder of municipal ownership I am "on the side of the capitalists" precisely as in opposing government ownership of railroads the American Federation of Labor and the railroad brotherhoods are on the side of the capitalists. I have constantly advocated the principle of withholding legal privileges by which capital may lay tribute on labor.

I have presented in this record no story of sacrifices; I have described a course marked by satisfactions.

When, contemplating the American trade union movement today, I realize that the fathers of hundreds of thousands of families have through organization obtained in the last quarter of a century a reduction of a fifth or more in the day's toil and an advance of a fourth or more in wages, to the benefit of their wives and children, I am rejoiced that I have been one of the millions in the movement. And if in the course of the struggle I have at times put forth a helpful suggestion at the needed hour, I am glad I was given the opportunity. And further, when my views as to a reign of justice in society gain once in a while their share of thoughtful attention, I feel that the world has paid me whatever debt it may have owed me.

(Following are the separate reviews of the joint labor report by the two labor investigators:)

THE LABOR REPORT

By J. W. SULLIVAN

My colleague and myself, in closing our joint inquiry as to wages and conditions in the British gas undertakings visited, agree in saying:

"Summarizing what precedes, with the exception of the twelve-hour stations of the South Metropolitan Company, and taking into account the general level of wages in the several localities, it cannot be said that there is any material difference between the public and private undertakings in the wages of stokers or in the average wages of the shift-workers in the retort houses. The differences that occur do not show a prevalence one way or the other, but they tend to follow pretty closely the general level of wages in the locality, irrespective of whether the undertaking is managed by a municipality or by a private company. The case of the twelve-hour shifts of the South Metropolitan Company is peculiar and requires the discussion of another aspect of the question —the amount of work done by the stokers."

Relative to the electricity undertakings, the investigation sums up:

"It has been found impossible to make a satisfactory comparison of the wages paid in electrical undertakings, on account of the wide differences in machinery, equipment, character of work, size of station, range of wages and names of occupations. The subdivision of labor varies greatly from place to place, and a large establishment with a minute subdivision of specialized workers may have extremely high wages for a few and extremely low for others, although the names of the occupations may be the same as those where the work is less subdivided. A careful examination of different payrolls and different stations, however, leads to the conclusion that, as in the gas undertakings, there is no predominating tendency one way or the other, and the differences depend mainly upon the differences in the general level of the wages of the locality."

The prevailing wage policy in the British municipalized undertakings investigated is to pay the skilled workmen trade union rates and the unskilled "a minimum wage." The conclusions in the foregoing paragraphs refer to the mechanics and semi-skilled men among the gas and electrical workers. With such exceptions as an alleged overstocking of the works with labor, as at a municipal gas station in Manchester mentioned in the report, and a favoring of hand labor in preference to machine labor, as in the Leicester municipal gas works, skilled or partly skilled labor had about equal chances with the two forms of management, municipal and company. That is, in these two industries, in all but the most poorly paid forms of labor, municipalization has not raised

the wage or workday conditions of the employees above conditions in the private undertakings, the exceptions noted above showing the dubious advantages of possibly providing municipal employees with work at the expense of the community or furnishing them with a leverage for the play of politics.

But with respect to "common, unorganized labor" the investigators found a difference somewhat favorable to British municipal employees. The report cites facts that explain the causes. (1) The municipal laborer is a picked man. (2) This class of labor offers an especial field for the Municipal Employees' Association, the new political trade unionists, and the Socialists and humanitarians of all walks of life who, demanding for labor at least "a living wage," desire to redeem municipal employment from participation in Great Britain's almost universal sweatshop labor market. Steady, ablebodied and capable of exerting on city councils a combined pressure, municipal unskilled laborers, no matter how organized or whether organized at all, obtain better terms than the employing councillors accord to the men they hire in their private capacity for similar work.

Councils recognize a "minimum wage"—a level below which a municipality will not fix any grade of pay. Yet it is to be noted that the percentage of the municipal minimum above "the private minimum," as quoted by the labor investigators, may in some communities signify little more than a comparison between the city's rate for the choice among laborers and the general rate for those private undertakings which employ men in perhaps the least requited of occupations. That is, the municipal laborers, shown by rigid examination as to physique and character to be sound, steady and nearer youth than age, earn more than the mass in the overstocked labor market, including the unreliable, the gray-haired and other classes unqualified for municipal work. On the average the money difference is shown by but a few shillings a week, though in selecting certain extremes for comparison a considerable percentage may be figured out. The widest contrast, at Leicester, 9s., very probably reflects the same influences that sent that city's Socialist representatives to Parliament. In several of the cities visited, indeed perhaps all, certain large private establishments give, in various ways, approximately the same wage terms as the municipality, or even better, as at Cadbury's and Tangey's, in Birmingham.

In the case of the South Metropolitan Gas Company of London—to quote an example in which a system has been worked out independently of the leveling-up influences bearing on city governments, the co-operative features of which, examined at such length, do not attract the unqualified admiration of the investigators—this is to be said: Its employees' stock in the company represents a larger sum than is similarly possessed by any equal number of laborers of the class in England, and its provisions for sickness, death and old age are unusual. Ninety odd per cent. of the employees of these works save something. A Labor Liberal

member of Parliament said of the company to one of our committee: "A gas worker can nowhere get a better job." The Co-operative Union accepts the works as a genuine example of co-operation. The shift men where twelve hours are worked themselves adopted that workday by a vote. The company asserts that it never opposed union labor in its mechanical departments, and withdrew its opposition to the gasworkers' union a few years after the strike of 1889.

Turning now to the tramways and light railways, we find 3,400 miles in the United Kingdom, the number operated by all the companies, some 1,500, being less than the mileage owned by a single American company in several instances. The number of miles operated by the seven companies and municipalities investigated by our experts reached perhaps 500, about Boston's mileage. The British tramway wage situation can only be seen correctly in the light of municipal developments out of what were company undertakings, the latter invariably being far different in their status as to property and degree of progress from the street railways of America. No street car undertaking in Great Britain has ever been a "private" enterprise in the sense in which the word is applied in this country. The twenty-one years' term of the franchise, the veto of company petitions by village authorities, the enormous cost of Parliamentary powers and local assents, and various other restrictions non-existent in the United States, shackle and impoverish British tramway company management and consequently forbid an intelligent investigator to employ British example to illustrate possibilities in America through change from private to municipal ownership. British tramways have always been semi-municipal. The English field of tramway exploitation, if common report in Britain is correct, has been occupied by only the most venturesome promoters, and their work has certainly not been ordinarily successful in the development of the industry, as compared with American standards and results. The burdens of the companies have usually permitted them to win only the barest returns by means of "skinning" methods throughout. The largest private British tramways company passed its dividend last July. Whether others of the largest companies will ever meet their obligations is a common doubt. As by the terms of their franchises all English tramway undertakings may be taken over by the municipalities, directors manage their properties with that end in view. While the companies seldom equal average private employers in ability to pay the wages of municipal tramway undertakings, the municipalities investigated by our committee are the most famous scenes of notable attempts at social reform carried on both by the champions of collectivist ownership and humanitarians endeavoring to mitigate the evils of slum life and to lower a general death rate that gave several of the cities in question an unenviable reputation. Higher wages in the municipality's tramways, however, is not the invariable rule. The private Norwich tramways manager showed that the company paid for electrical

workers the same scale as the city, and in some grades claimed 20 per cent. higher than Ipswich, Yarmouth and Lowestoft. It is to be kept in mind also that usually only the most promising undertakings have been taken over by the cities. As a result, chiefly during the transition from horse to electric traction, British municipalities have established a lead as to wages and workday, but by no means a notable lead, and one not yet finally established. Compared, however, with the remarkable changes for the better in wages and hours in the American street car industry under companies and trade unionism, the best of the British municipal labor improvements seem hardly more than trivial.

Little attention has been given in the report to the class of British municipalizers who, with indefinite plans and revolutionary principles, would carry municipal ownership into fields wherever, in their optimism, they imagine promise of a speedy remedy for civic abuses or economic betterment for the masses. If any of the utopian schemes of these municipalizers had still bid fair to be fulfilled, doubtless the facts would have been given passing recognition and the hopeful outlook touched upon. Space would have been given to any probability of paying new ventures springing out of tried and successful ones. Omission to do so is at least to be noted. Rather are there indications in the report that the tide in practical municipalization is turned. Where advocates once looked for a constant expansion, this has been arrested by disillusion. Government ownership of undertakings of electricity and light railways covering supra-municipal areas may be called for, but there the practical political leaders show a disposition to halt. With regard to municipal lodgings, steamboats and miscellaneous supplies, there has been reaction. Platform demands may be more numerous than ever with extremely radical theorists who have the ear of the clamorous among the hungry masses, but the recent elections have gone against the radical sentiment, and appropriations from councils and Parliament are commonly expected to cease or follow slowly.

To put the foregoing points broadly, these are the general labor results of municipalization in Great Britain:

(1) The wage level among municipal mechanics and other skilled men varies little if any from the trade union scale, as paid in the private undertakings. (2) For common municipal labor the wages and workday are better than for the average of private labor, the difference being due to several causes, among them the individual superiority of the picked municipal men and the influence of collectivism, humanitarianism and socialist politics. (3) Industries once marked out by British municipalizers as areas for municipal employment are now given up by their practical leaders.

In America, the municipalized enterprises visited by our labor investigators have been rich mines for significant facts relating to politics rather than to labor. These facts are not usually among those heretofore emphasized by the American advocates of municipal ownership. The testimony as to political rottenness, root and

branch, in Syracuse, Allegheny and Wheeling is conclusive. The municipal plants examined in these cities, it is to be remembered, were selected as models by representative municipalizers of the Commission. Nor is the politico-labor situation in Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago or Richmond at all settled as well as it might be. Just which of the secretaries and superintendents at Detroit in the thirteen years have been purely political appointments, just how many of the trustees have been put on the commission to serve special interests rather than the community, just to what degree organized labor has employed coercion with the mayor, and just how much of an electrician the superintendent of electricity ought to be—fierce argument over such points, as well as the actual cost per light, have kept Detroit in the heat of debate ever since the public electricity station was established. In Cleveland, the present mayor in the beginning increased his reform forces in the public water department so as to strengthen his vote in the primaries—an act possible at all times also under the next and succeeding administrations, which may be bad where the present is good. The degree of purity attained by the present administration is attributable to the officials and the public sentiment aroused, and not to municipalization. In Chicago, where civil service is ironclad, the appointment by the mayor of department heads and even of the Civil Service Commission itself, has more than once proved a vulnerable point in the civic armor, with sad results. In Detroit, Cleveland or Chicago the stability of the municipally operated enterprises rests largely on the mayor, who, however personally estimable and statesmanlike, necessarily becomes as a candidate a relatively good or bad politician, representing for a brief term a policy that may change with his successor. It is plain that in this political situation the resultant labor problem is most difficult. An employee can only hold office in uncertainty, with its consequent evils. He knows not what a coming term will bring. This form of disquiet is not usual in private employment. That it exists in Great Britain among municipal works managers is a certainty. The foremost operating official in one of the largest private tramways said: "I would not be a manager for a corporation" (municipality). A civil engineer told one of our committeemen: "Many managers for corporations seek to get away by finding company positions."

As to Richmond, its exclusion of black men suggests a burning race question indeed, North and South, were municipalization generally adopted and Richmond's example in that respect followed. That feature vitiates any inferences as to the labor problem that otherwise might be made with the Richmond gas works as a basis. To institute a comparison with Atlanta and reach conclusions relating to wages in municipal *vs.* private plants, while ignoring the real and obvious factor in the retort-house wage differences—the race question—would be simply to fail to record all the truth.

Many municipalizers, as did the Populists, vigorously uphold the theory that the root of the evils connected with municipal administration in America is found in the money power seeking franchises. While anti-municipal reformers are endeavoring to strip this power of any sinister influence it possesses by refining the provisions for the regulation of franchise grants to the point that will leave no more than rightful returns for investments, the municipalizers assert that this harmful power is the main prop of the political machine and that the voters can only protect the municipality against it and reduce the machine to a skeleton through municipal ownership. The point is not to be enlarged on here that thereby they might but erect in the end a hundredfold more harmful machinery; or that they have set out with an exaggerated notion of the present-day necessity of corporations to struggle for further franchise grants, and also an inadequate appreciation of certain elements of the machine, such as the purchasable vote, and of its varied sources of revenue, such as the numerous Federal, State and local offices, elective or appointive, usually for short terms; the host of public contractors; the "outs" as well as the "ins" among the politicians; the liquor interest, with a politician dealer in every election district; the police; the real estate and other speculators and even ordinary business men who receive bosses' notices to help in campaigns. Rather, the point necessary first to decide is whether the bosses blackmail the capitalist investors, as they do all others they can reach, or whether the capitalists maintain franchise-getting bosses as their tools. The municipalizers who believe that the capitalists are the instigators in the game naturally are alive to find facts to confirm their suspicions—yet every one knows that such facts are most difficult to establish. Political campaigns abound in rumors, with what bases all may guess and few know. A little time spent by an investigator in any community in America may yield him whispers derogatory to almost every man of the locality ever in politics. To sift this backstairs and darkroom talk down to substantial truth is a task seldom carried out. The characterless politician who declares that he himself helped to extort bribery money from corporations or handled enforced contributions is a knave not to be believed. One can build any theory on such evidence as his gossip. Notes taken of even the confidential revelations of good men with strong political bias may lead to conclusions regarding certain city councils or certain evil social tendencies which remain sound until flatly contradicted by men equally virtuous and equally positive. The hunt is every man's. In America the hunt is livelier and the game more plentiful than in Britain.

So numerous and so signal are other differences, political and economic, between labor conditions in Great Britain and America, that to summarize them here would prove a formidable task. They are outlined in Professor Goodnow's "British Municipality," and in the labor investigators' "Suffrage," "Working Class Conditions," and "Labor and Politics." One who has read these chapters can

never again freely employ British municipal developments in ownership and operation, whatever their effects, as precedents easily to be imitated in America. The British municipalization movement is shown as originating in social conditions—even to the working-class death rate—utterly removed from conditions in this country. Possibilities for the masses were not the same, the voting power differs, the steps to be taken here could not be similar to those taken there, and the status now arrived at and the results in view in Britain differ, to a degree no one can with any certainty estimate, from what is probable in America.

Any advantage in wages or hours to be figured out for the municipal enterprises investigated in America over the private ones compared with them look much like stale illustrations of the soft berths to be found in public employment. To what extent the jobs are political for the employees, singly or collectively, or a bid for the labor vote is constantly a question. On this point my colleague aptly says: "In the municipal undertakings a larger proportion of the positions are likely to be semi-political." In Chicago one of the union secretaries, in speaking of the city officials granting the union scale, avowed: "We tell them, 'These are our rates'; they're politicians, and they know what to do." When the secretary of the Wheeling gas trustees was asked: "Who fixes the wages and conditions at the works?" his reply was: "The men!" He described their strikes as not trade union but political, connived at by council members and other city officials. In Syracuse the two-dollar rate to laborers goes notoriously to political workers. The disclosures of political rule at Syracuse, Allegheny and Wheeling would make it a mockery of scientific observation to ascribe the high wages for laborers in those municipal undertakings to the "virtues" of municipal ownership. A summary of minimum wage comparisons between private and municipal enterprises must call for many modifications. First, it is to be remembered that the "minimum" of private wages is not the standard of private wages in a community, but the lowest point for the poorest paid class in particular enterprises. A comparison of the various private and municipal classifications up to the highest is not possible, inasmuch as the forces of the large companies are subdivided in finer gradations than the comparatively small forces of the municipalities. Practical men will derive their impressions on this point from our wage tables. A correct view, then, takes in these points: Syracuse, the wages situation politically debauched; Wheeling, the same; Allegheny, the same, to an extent that when a difference of 50 to 100 per cent. in favor of municipalization is soberly computed by one man it makes another laugh. Detroit, private and municipal plants but a shade difference. Cleveland, nine hours municipal as against ten in the general labor market, wages the same. Indianapolis, no municipal undertakings, the rate quoted being for the public departments, for which much of the work is irregular; the water company pays nearly all its laborers $1.75. Chicago, the words "minimum wages" here obtain so

great a significance that, if the tabular statements were not at hand as a corrective, a generally erroneous impression of the average wages paid by the companies investigated might be derived. Of 252 laborers, less than one-fourth are paid as low as $1.75 per day, and these could not pass the city's civil service examination. Ten hours is the exception with the companies' employees. The Chicago firemen in the fire department do not receive union rates. New Haven, no municipal undertaking; hours, eight, public departments, as against nine water works. Richmond-Atlanta, where white as against black labor is employed, economic comparison gives way to race comparison. Philadelphia, United Gas Improvement Company, better wages and hours than any city department, and a reduction from twelve-hour shifts under municipal operation to eight under the company with higher wages. Further points to be kept in view: With the companies mentioned, many times more hands are employed than with the municipalities; good men have been more certain of retaining their places; the employees pay no political assessments and are otherwise politically free; they work under better conditions as to comfort and future prospects.

Up to this stage of our survey, the showing of exceptional benefits to the wage workers employed by British or American municipalities, where any whatever have appeared, has been attended with a showing of positive detriment in so many respects as to give a picture in striking contrast with that usually heretofore exhibited to the world by municipalizers.

Passing from the pure wage and workday phase of our study, we have to record certain fundamental differences between public and private employment always observable to a greater or less extent, and with regard to which the labor report offers testimony, direct or indirect. These differences exist from the point of view of the employer, the employee and society. Being differences of kind, they do not depend on the attitude of passing administrations or individual managers.

The relations between the private employer and his employee are simple. If the employer pays the wages and the employee turns out the work agreed upon, the parties are quits as to business. If the two supplement business with kindly sentiments, the way is clear to promote the happiness of both, in word and deed. This principle runs good in the largest service, as to the head or his representatives face to face with the force. The trade union in its simple form does not aim to change this relation. It would establish minimum wages and hours and a standard of working conditions, but leave the employer free in hiring and discharging, under the trade agreement provisions, and the employee also free aside from his union ties. But public employment, not to speak of its rigidity of forms and methods, its faults of delay and oversight, gives rise, partly through politics but especially through its essentials of authority and restraint, to a maze of complications. Some of these, and their hurtfulness, as illustrated by facts in the labor report, call for mention.

Public employees, frequently against their will, under duress from officials who may injure them, promote by election contributions the fortunes of certain men and parties, though at heart they may be opposed to both. With these employees, violation of manly principle and dishonor to the State are secondary to holding their places. In Detroit, the "yellow assessment book" is passed around in all the city departments except that of electricity, in which, however, only a few years ago it was also circulated. In Wheeling, the smallest officeholder who fails to pay his political assessment is speedily dislodged. In Syracuse, where "even the scrubwomen" are assessed by the party in power, it was said that a proceeding not unheard of was a subscription by an official to both parties. In Allegheny, the one body of workmen who, through their union, refused to contribute to campaign funds, were punished by an increase of work at no higher pay. In London, it was but an enforced party contribution when at one of his meetings the opponents of Lord Avebury packed the gallery with municipal employees "to shout so as not a word could be heard." The conditions for coercion may exist even where it is not exerted for the time being. In Chicago and Cleveland the heads of departments, always active supporters of their respective mayor's political policy, must when ordered, to the extent possible, introduce politics or vacate office. In Detroit, a man whose appointment was of "a distinctly political character," was for years "the dominating figure" in the Public Lighting Commission, and that may be the case again. Neither the acts nor the conditions just described are characteristic of private employment. And they are clearly not of a kind out of which develops the independent citizenship upon which free institutions are to rest.

The executive—mayor, councilman or department head—not only in appointing but in promoting or dismissing employees is exposed to partisan, personal, social or other pressure. Of the British cities visited, partisanship in this respect was least disguised in London, but in several others "lines to councillors," by obtaining for applicants the printed forms, could insure them the first necessary step toward a hearing. In Glasgow, Sheffield and Leicester this practice interfered with the fair play due all citizens seeking work. A few years ago foisting a body of incompetents on a city's payroll was more common in Great Britain than at present; the wave of municipal reform and the revolt of the wage workers served for a time to suppress this custom; but whether the betterment is to be permanent or the same abuses are not creeping in under new forms are fears now given common expression. In machine ruled American cities the spoils system gives to the party in power the right to fill all the offices; even in the better governed cities a change of administration brings good reason for uneasiness to all employees not fully protected by law. Municipal employment as a consequence can rarely attract the same class of upright, self-respecting, capable wage workers as private employment. Here is a fact of grave import in its social significance, and it is of a

scope as wide as the labor market. It reveals one valid reason why the people the least governed are the best governed.

Municipal employees directly, and the employed class in general only less immediately, may undermine the integrity of the employing city official. The Municipal Employees' Association of Great Britain, whose members "do not vote" for candidates that decline to comply with their demands, is the prototype of combinations sure to be formed with more or less definiteness wherever the ballot may be used as a bludgeon. Exposed to this menace, a municipal councillor or manager must decide in all his acts with reference not only to his duty but to his fate on election day. Just as he must not defy his party, local or national, and must be aware of injuring other powerful voting elements, he must not offend this or that class of labor. As my colleague truly says: "Municipal employees sooner or later cast their votes for candidates who promise or who have secured a betterment of their condition, regardless of its effect on the enterprise as a whole"—or, it may be added, on the community as a whole. In the minds of most citizens this admission is sufficient to blast any scheme that brings with it a solid band of voters bent not on the common good but their own selfish ends. To gain these they would betray any other cause.

In America, threatening to ruin a party or a candidate in the name of labor seeking justice has long been a move of both true and false labor leaders. The latter have played the game *ad nauseam* in every community, to the disgust and mortification of honest labor men, yet they continue to catch dupes. To dodge the punitive vote of some class, or color, or creed, or nationality that gives strength to a pack of arrant demagogues, the officeholder plays to the galleries, the public teacher with ambitions becomes dumb, and the political organ suppresses news or modifies opinions. The professional labor politician, finding himself possessed of manipulative power, is as liable to attempt to pervert the vote of his union as he would that of any other organization giving him support. Even in unions in which there is no perversion an undue emphasis is at times placed upon the union ballot, through whose strength an unfair profit may be taken from a municipality. On October 10 last the business agent of the building trades unions appeared before a Chicago council committee and said that unless the city agreed to pay double wages for overtime to its employees in the organizations he represented they would refuse to work beyond the regular eight hours, no matter what the emergency. The committee voted to recommend to the council the ordinance providing for double pay. The opposition daily press in consequence had its jeers for the administration, not so much that it was fighting the wage workers as that it recognized the politicians' need of backbone. In recent years in Great Britain the legitimate objects of the old line labor unions have been frequently cast into the shade in view of the possible fruits of election day. Regardless of the hurtful effect on private employment, the leaders of common

labor have made all that can be squeezed through platform demands from the City Hall the general proposed standard of wages. Unionists opposed to this policy are "obstacles to the welfare of labor." The stronger sentiment for the hour in British labor circles has been voiced in: "Vote with us or you are not a union man"; "Pay an assessment for our labor candidates, or take the consequences." When this is the case the union member who talks and votes as he thinks, if in the minority, takes risks. And therein so far is destruction to independent democracy. Such a situation in any union of Americans would presage its collapse.

The wage worker who reads the labor report cannot but perceive that municipalization in various ways carries perils to the trade union. In the first place, the field for the labor vote manipulator enlarges with municipal employment. But many unionists refuse to be moved about like pawns, and the lukewarm union member declining either to support or to fight the growing strength of pernicious labor politicians has one more reason to drop out of the union should occasion arise. Again, individual unionists at work for municipalities learn to look to politics for help; whole unions do so, as in the case of the British electrical workers, and in so far they are out of the real union movement. They are engrafted political clubs, not trade unions. They carry perversion into the ranks of genuine unionism. Such unions, as my colleague says of the British Municipal Employees' Association, "weaken other unions while building on their support." A British trade union secretary, speaking of unions of city employees, said: "It is not difficult to organize them to get an increase; the trouble is to hold them afterward." Unionism and office holding, even of the pettiest grade, do not fuse. Another source of undermining the union movement lies in such municipal benefit and pension schemes as have forestalled the unionization of both the Glasgow and Liverpool tramway forces. Inevitably, purely trade union organization will be discouraged with the progress of political trade union organization. The national labor movement in Great Britain was perhaps necessarily changed in character for a time through the Taff-Vale decision; a political demonstration was unavoidable; but the ensuing political events, despite voices of warning, carried the unions to a point difficult to distinguish from Socialism. And similarly, the steps beyond a union campaign for municipalization in this country, and a stage of municipalization itself, should this come, cannot be foreseen by American unionists. There might indeed come a glimpse of the wonders of collectivism, but erected on the ruins of unionism.

It may be urged that unions in America have been committed to the support of municipalization, but it is far from being so in the sense that many of the unions have been in Great Britain. It is true that conventions of the American Federation of Labor, while almost unanimously voting down the socialistic element, have passed resolutions approving of municipal ownership and operation of monopolies. It is also true that ten years ago conventions of the Federation indorsed free silver, and it is equally true that the

great industrial centres, strongly unionized, heaped up large majorities against the free silver candidate for the Presidency, and that the issue is now forgotten. Of like significance it was when the delegates to an annual convention of the International Typographical Union voted, 100 to 6, against the referendum in the organization; but the members reversed the delegates by 6 to 1. The broad underlying fact in these reversions of conventions by the membership is that, while American unionists permit their convention delegates an indefinite liberty in passing resolutions, especially if these refer to the generally recognized evils of monopoly, when the question of a practical remedy is voted on at the polls each man acts on his own judgment. The American unions, unlike those of Great Britain, do not support candidates and public officeholders out of their union treasuries. While central labor unions may indorse municipal ownership in the abstract, our investigators found no instance of an American trade union taking an active part in the elections for municipal officers. In New York last year eleven municipal ownership aldermen were elected, but not as trade unionists.

Great Britain's present municipal political conditions have brought about a discussion of the disfranchisement of municipal employees. Sir John Ure Primrose, recent Lord Provost of Glasgow, who presided at one of the meetings attended by our committee, said on a previous occasion: "We have reached a point where we begin to see a danger ahead, and this one which, from what I know of your peculiar political system, is likely to be more threatening to you than to us. This arises out of the building up of a great army of municipal employees." Mr. E. O. Smith, town clerk of Birmingham since 1881, testified before a Parliamentary committee: "I should like to see all corporate employees disfranchised." Sir Thomas Hughes, alderman since 1878, except during his two terms as mayor, said to the same committee: "I have known an instance where combination was the occasion of a very good man being thrown out of his position as a councillor simply because they thought he did not favor" (the municipal employees). "I should gladly welcome" (disfranchisement). Manager Dalrymple of the Glasgow tramways, through conscientious scruples, does not vote. He favors disfranchising public servants, and does not permit tramway employees to take part in municipal politics beyond voting. Lord Stanley, when postmaster general, tried to have Parliament pass a bill disfranchising postmen. He failed of re-election, and the organized postmen speak of having finished his career, unaware that in this boast they apprize the lay citizen of the postmen's adhesion to a bureaucracy apart from the community, with interests of its own. The British way out of the dilemma of an army of public servants become a public menace may be disfranchisement; a like dilemma, and the menace of a similar fate to free wage workers, are yet avoidable in America.

One showing of our labor investigations is a tendency of municipal employees in either country to refuse to enter unions

when nothing is to be gained at once for themselves, or having organized and taken a profit to quit singly or in a body. This comes from the fact that while the union idea is to master the labor market of an occupation and then by strike or negotiation to mark up labor prices, a different idea in time predominantly animates the municipal employee. The minds of his employers, the higher office-holders, being affected by the variety of considerations above noted that do not enter the mind of a private employer, it is for the municipal employee to study those considerations and when they involve political destinies to turn them to his own account. The strike, with the necessary maintenance of trade union machinery, is not so facile and inexpensive as political influence and pressure, with no regular weekly or monthly dues to support the combination exerting them. And why when the political method is operative and promising should the public employee also help carry the union? The gas workers of Wheeling "immediately dropped out of the union" on receiving even less advantages than those the local Trade Assembly was struggling to obtain for them. In this they unknowingly imitated the gas workers of the municipal plant at Rotherham, adjoining Sheffield, who disbanded on obtaining through the laborers' national union officials an advance to an equal footing with the Sheffield Gas Company's men. On this action a Sheffield labor councillor commented: "They can now neither help themselves nor any one else." The Leicester municipal gas workers, when pleaded with by Secretary Will Thorne to pay dues to his union, thus to help their brothers elsewhere, coldly held aloof, gave not a penny, and voted not to organize. Municipal employees are surely in the union movement when they want help, but they may be out of it when called on for help. The promoters of a new union cannot discriminate among the qualified applicants for membership nor shape too definitely the union's own policies. It is not the organizer's fault if employing municipal officials are more easily persuaded to lend a hand than private employers, or if municipal employees on occasions come into the union on a little judicious persuasion with more alacrity than hands who have got along with their employers well for years. And if a stage is early reached at which the union's scale and requirements, as enforced upon the municipality, are so far above the market rates for some grades of skill, and so crude and arbitrary as not to be adaptable to the various special developments of the industry, there will be found outside the organization many men in private employment who by proper management ought to be within. This is by some electrical workers in Chicago described as the union situation there. It would perhaps be to the political interest of the Chicago Edison Company to have a unionized force, but the union's scale is not adapted to the company's forty-odd subdivisions of employees. To some extent the same line of reasoning is applicable to other occupations. If the thought is correct, the general trade union movement suffers from whatever is spurious in the municipal employees' unions. The selfishness of the municipal employees in driving the

best bargain for themselves, regardless of the possibilities of a general organization with modified demands, is a fatal flaw in the new unionism. To point to a so-called union force working for a municipality and a non-union force in the same occupation working for private employers is not a conclusive argument for municipalization to the experienced union man. Every non-union private force is in possible union territory, and once gained the force will most likely be permanently and actually union. And for the promotion of a wholesome, honest and solid unionism a certain opposition by private employers is necessary. It teaches the employer obligation, the non-unionist the benefits of organization in any form, and the unionist the just and practicable limitations of his claims. With an open opposition from private employers, such as exists to-day in the mining industry governed by the trade agreement, the unionists know where they are. With the half-union and half-political patchwork compromise existing between union business agents and municipal officials, the union spokesmen are in a false position, the city officials are usually under suspicion as time-servers, the unions immediately concerned are not in every respect genuine, and the union movement is handicapped.

To some trade union leaders the policy of working up wages by first establishing a high municipal wage rate and then promoting strikes in private employment for the same standard is advanced as one easily worked. It has its limitations, and its steps in practice may be forestalled. Very few classes of wage workers are employed by the city government. It is not worth while for fifty occupations to take up the political method for the possible benefit of perhaps five. And the masses of the men concerned in private employ will not always permit themselves to be used, as the policy suggests, to run up high wages for a small minority while awaiting a problematical future move on their own behalf. The contracts with individual workmen made by British municipalities and companies defeat the policy wholly in so far as gas and water employees are concerned.

"Open shop" is the inevitable character of municipal, as all other government, employment. Appointments must be possible to all citizens. Union rules and orders must give way in the shop to the law and official decisions. The Miller case of the government printing office at Washington set at rest reasonable doubt on these points, one result recently being the refusal of seventy members of the typographical union in that office to pay the union eight-hour assessment. In the municipal enterprises investigated at Richmond, South Norwalk, Syracuse, Allegheny, Wheeling, Detroit, Cleveland and Chicago the laborers are not organized, while in the mechanical trades both union and non-union men without discrimination hold positions. Through the activity of business agents union men may at some municipal plants obtain a larger proportion of situations than non-union, but rarely can the agent compel the municipal employee, if firmly unwilling, to pay his union dues. By the agitation of central labor unions, groups of municipal employees

may get better terms from a city and then be free to remain apart from the labor movement. In Great Britain, when the mechanics of a city engage in a strike against a lowering of wages, the union municipal employees remain at work, but if the strike is lost their wages are reduced with those of the strikers. In the little South Norwalk, Connecticut, electrical works the non-union hands have been exempted from membership in the Bridgeport union, a course possibly helpful to municipal ownership but if pursued consistently not to trade unionism. These facts, illustrating endless artificial obstacles to unionism in public employ, hardly describe a possible prospect under municipalization for building up in America a united body of wage workers animated with one set of hopes, rules and aims. In fact, the enemies of trade unionism might divide and conquer it through municipal ownership, were the cost not socially prohibitive.

Municipalities are impersonal employers. They operate through mechanisms. Petitions from individual employees, for example, may meet refusal by a reference of the signers to the regulations; those from a body, if recognized at all, must go by way of red tape finally to the power making appropriations. The higher municipal officials can arrange for such matters as the comfort and convenience of employees only as themselves invested with funds and authority, which is rarely the case, or they may affect to sympathize with the members of a force while really plotting against their interests. But the private employer or his representative can be reached directly by the employed and a decision arrived at quickly. In this case the two parties see each other in the open. In kindness or unkindness man faces man. Results of these two forms of relationship between the employer and the employed, municipal and company, as recorded in the labor report, and indeed as observed by our committeemen generally, do not confirm the assertions, so assiduously given circulation by municipalizers, that municipalization has tended to abolish workplace hardships and introduce new comforts in the workingman's life. Usually attempts to "live up to the brag" in Great Britain have been flat failures. At the main Glasgow works, of the day shift of 500 men, but a dozen in the course of the week make use of the shower baths, only a corporal's guard go to the mess room, few enter the reading hall—the structure for these purposes, which stands too far away from the works proper to permit of immediate use, not being provided with necessary conveniences—toweling, means for drying clothes, methods for the care of library matter. At Leicester, but 72 of the 600 employees care enough for the club and recreation hall to pay 2d. a week to enjoy its privileges. The two great gas stations of Birmingham—Saltley and Nechells—have heretofore lacked the common bathing facilities always looked for at gas works. As a rule, however, British workmen have not been taught to expect the same consideration as American. The appearance of new conveniences in recent years at some of the British municipal works has furnished to enthusiastic Fabian writers

the grounds for many praises and ardent hopes for the coming millennial era through their social revolution, but the innovations were merely what has been customary in many American establishments. The welfare works of Great Britain's municipal undertakings, while a shade better than the private, seem to have not been worth any especial notice from our own investigators. When a good word is said for Liverpool's coffee and cake and billiard rooms at one of the car depots, and the tidiness of two or three retiring places at other plants, the subject is quite exhausted. In this country the company plants visited have usually far better methods both for assuaging hardship and encouraging men in self-respect and worthy ambition than the municipal. In Chicago, the Edison Company's close personal relationship with its employees stands in sharp contrast with that municipality's neglect of even decent accommodations for its electrical workers. Mean appointments and dirt are characteristic of Chicago's municipal electric stations. The Edison Company's system of instruction and club-room features has no counterpart in the city's electrical department, while the company's gradation of employees and promotion on merit form a practical civil service that needs no commission with theories and is operative every day in the year.

Something is revealed in the difference in appearance of the men seen about public and private offices and workrooms. "This office," said the chief gas inspector in the Richmond City Hall, "used to be political headquarters. The fellows stood about, or sat on the desks and tables, and had the telephone going all the time. I put up 'walk back' notices, said I meant everybody, and succeeded in a partial reformation." This picture is familiar to every American citizen who has had business at the city hall or court-house. The scramblers for petty offices or short-term jobs between election times hang about to discuss the moves on the political chessboards. Their manners are not the manners of men in private business places. The public office or workroom itself is usually wanting in the cleanliness, furniture and facilities observable in the private. A key here in either case to causes that operate upon efficiency at every stage.

Not one of the British or American municipal plants of any kind presented a systematized combination of features in the form of benefits, education, grading, welfare work, care for the aged, etc., that gave the slightest foundation for the claim of municipalization advocates that with public ownership arise striking evidences of closer sympathetic relations between employer and employed. On the contrary, in reciting the undeniable facts as to the watchfulness of American companies over the health, comfort, technical education and advancement in business of their employees, one's words may be construed as praise where the intent is no more than exact report. The reader is invited to consult our labor statements on these points and form his own judgment. The Chicago Edison Company and the Philadelphia United Gas Improvement Company, each far more extensive than the largest municipal

gas or electric works visited abroad, exhibit both ripened business judgment and strong sentiments of fellowship in numerous forms of care for their employees, whether at work or at play. It is but one's plain duty to call attention also to the exemplary oversight of the Indianapolis Water Company in regard to the material conditions of its force, to the New Haven Company's record for retaining its employees, and to the Atlanta Company's interesting methods of rewards beyond wages. Nor, since our task is a comparison of methods, is it invidious to direct attention to the table of terms of service in the Glasgow municipal tramways, giving color as it does to the assertions of a Glasgow correspondent of the London "Clarion" (Socialist), who wrote, January 19, 1906, that: "Motor men and conductors to be employed on the tramways must produce a five years' reference, but on leaving, unless going abroad, no character is given; that the conductors have to pay the full face value for lost tickets; that the men are supposed to report each other for neglect of duty; that men have been suspended for not wearing the regulation uniform, for punching a ticket in the wrong place, and for numberless trifles which no private employer would think of even checking a man for." This correspondent also called attention to the large number who leave every year, owing to the many petty grievances and irregularity of the hours with which they have to put up. Our investigators' table shows that 1,085 of the 2,433 have less than three years' standing as employees.

The Liverpool municipal tramways service employs no man under the age of thirty years. Glasgow takes on no elderly men as lamplighters, watchmen, etc. Few, if any, of the British undertakings investigated instruct beginners at laboring work. Such facts throw on the municipal "minimum wage" a light different from that in which it stands when the shillings that may be gained under it have isolated mention. The British municipality selects a workman after proof of his character and mental and physical fitness, it hires no aging man, usually obliges the young learner to obtain his knowledge and certificate from a private employer, strictly holds the employee up to discipline, and discharges him by rule and regulation. As little compunction is to be expected as when the city of Glasgow seizes the last stick of furniture of the poor man to satisfy a claim for gas, water or electricity. Herein are many indications that municipal wage rates, including pension schemes, are to a considerable extent but the effect of trade union and labor vote pressure and not of the brotherly feeling of the higher office holders. On the whole, a municipality, British or American, pays the wage the law prescribes and there it stops. Numerous obstacles inherent in public employment stand in the way of having it do more.

The American employee properly infused with our national spirit seeks a career in which he, alike with his fellows, may hope to reap due rewards and suffer just penalties, while retaining in every respect his liberties as a freeman. But the obstacles to this

ideal condition are endless in public employ. As we have seen, it usually offers to the aspirant the vicious spoils system, or in a few cases a schoolboy civil service examination, partly absurd and on occasion humiliating, with the possibility, as a climax of injury, of disfranchisement. The directing administrators of a municipality —mayor, councilmen, department heads—officially, by nature or their terms of service, can promise the employee but short memories, vacillating judgments and varying policies. These deficiencies cannot engender the confidence in his future that puts vim into a man's work. Moreover, in official life but little play is offered for the heart. The usual public expression of indebtedness beyond wages —pensions—is a standing testimony to enormous abuse. In the public service, opportunity to advance even when legally prearranged through examinations systematized and robbed of attraction to versatile mentality and high character, is exposed to influence and political plotting. A public employee without backing may never be given occasion to prove his peculiar abilities; even bare legal recognition of his proper claims may tardily be conceded. The average public employee displays a sufficiently high order of merit to hold his place if he merely follows the code of rules mechanically. To a certain limit he may be slovenly, indolent, illnatured, unhelpful, selfish, unobliging to the public, and yet incur no punishment. Private employment in general does not develop this character; it rewards ideas, alertness, civility, cleanliness, energy. A force of public employees with rights under the regulations invariably become a band of lay lawyers who know the loopholes of the law favorable to themselves. "Old soldiers," they are capable of violating the spirit while paying it outward deference. Every public employee daily faces the riddle as to where his obligation as the government's man ends and his freedom as a citizen begins; post office employees may not combine and agitate while off duty with a view to an increase in their salaries. Not to give the proposition to disfranchise any weight, the prohibition of pernicious political activity is at once a notice to public employees that they stand in a category apart from citizens in general, a recognition by the community that they live too near power to be trusted, and a warning that the menace that they constitute ought not to be increased. A desirable humanitarianism in public service, such as a maximum annual sick leave, may through perversion become simply an emolument of office; a necessary exercise of preference by superiors, a means of favoritism; a system of promotions on examination, a device to reward spasmodic cramming and defeat sterling every-day capability. The disparities of pay and treatment and length of workday so frequently observed among various classes of public employees illustrate the difficulties of adjusting details through statutes. To organized labor the problem presented by municipal employment through possible falling away of members, misrepresentation by vote hucksters, and the gradual transition from unionism to politics, is rendered the more complicated by the fact that no private blacklist ever instituted has been

so sweeping as that operative through civil service or similar inquisition against a discharged public employee. Once out for cause, to re-enter the public service is a heart-breaking task.

If these observations are true they are proofs that private employment is free from manifold drawbacks that in the public service lower efficiency, form automatons, and discourage a proper and manly self-assertion. To a large extent the various objections noted in this review are stated or suggested in our labor report; and American wage workers already give them wide recognition in practice. Among the more independent there is a large class who consider that precisely as the field of public employment is enlarged—with its age limits, its uncertainties, its unsettled and always doubtful civil service, its asylums for barnacles, its artificial relationships, its unrequited exactions, its inducements to hypocrisy and filchings—the field in which they may find honest work, or any work, is diminished. No man can entertain that view of the extension of private employment, in its variety. There, the more work the more chance for all.

But when all is said on the vexed question of public versus private employment, only a single phase of the workingman's relation to municipalizing has been seen. Not by an enormous percentage is the working class citizenship represented by municipal employees, and not by a considerable percentage even by the trade unionists. A majority of the latter might for a time decide to support municipal ownership and operation and yet come far from truly representing the whole of the workers. This can only be done by the total masses of society who through work of all grades are in the broader sense producers. These have at stake infinitely the greatest interests—political, economic, social. Rarely is this truth accorded its full weight. The eye-glass of political reformers—and men of all parties so consider themselves—is commonly directed alternately on the public employee to ascertain if he has been made better off by municipal experiments on trial, and on the organized mass of wage workers whose votes on an issue may be decisive. While all men feel that the general good is what is meant to be subserved, heated argument over lesser phases is thus the partisan habit. When one reflects on the comprehensive significance of the term "the wage earner" and is told that "the tendency of municipal ownership is to benefit the wage earner more in the United States than in Great Britain" he is struck both with the absurdity of attributing stiff municipal wages to altruistic origins and with the pitiful inadequacy of the descriptive term employed, unless there lurks in it the promise of a paradise when the army of public employees shall be increased without limit.

Another highly important point is often lost to view. Even if the reformer in office is genuine, even if he has a scheme that promises well for the working masses, there arises the question of the duration of his official powers and those of his successors with similar aims, together with the persistence of the public in assiduous attention to its own self-protection. What may be done during

a voters' upheaval is neither a measure of what is possible to public administration as the decades go by nor a guarantee that the spirit of reform is to have no rest until the last serious grievance is ended. The steady strain on voters, with the distraction of new issues, is heavy. The public-spirited councilmen who planned Richmond's gas enterprise in 1851 provided in the City Code that on February 1 of each year the municipal auditor should ascertain the cost of gas for the previous twelve months and fix its price accordingly for the ensuing twelve. Long ago forgotten by the public, this article is probably unknown at the present time to nearly all the council members. Directly in violation of it, the gas works revenues are regularly used to reduce the local taxes; that is, those citizens who burn gas pay their own taxes and a part of what are justly due from their neighbors. The injustice is yet more flagrant in the case of the black taxpayers who are gas consumers, for their payments help in giving the exclusively white gas employees wages far above the market rate for negroes or even for white men. Thrice removed from privilege, the black gas consumers live on under this outrage, municipal reform asleep. Their burden is not on the scale it might be were Richmond a Glasgow in municipalization, but it has the sanction of time, the community's conscience in this respect fossilized. Birmingham, the birthplace of English municipalization, has exhibited in its gas works from the start a failure to recognize the principle that to take money from the gas consumers in order to reduce the rates is an arbitrary double taxation. Birmingham's minimum wage, the lowest of the larger English cities, comes down near sweatshop levels, and its provisions for the comfort of its gas workers are well-nigh non-existent. A gang of its coke-stackers, cleaning up in the foul works wash room after their day's work, voiced this plaint to several members of our committee: "This is the hardest work in Birmingham, and the poorest paid." Commenting on the $250,000 annually turned into the municipal treasury by the Birmingham works, the Gas Workers' Trade Union secretary said: "The poorest class of workpeople pay an extraordinary price for gas—3s. 2d (76 cents)—and what the poor burn is the backbone of the industry. Large consumers pay 1s. 7d. (38 cents), medium, 2s. 6d. (60 cents.)" Contrast these various points with the same points as related to Sheffield's gas company. This company sells a better quality of gas than Birmingham at 1s. 1d. (26 cents) to 1s. 6d. (36 cents). Its employees have wages as high as those of Sheffield's municipal employees or higher. Their welfare as workmen is well cared for. The city, although it owns no stock in the company, has its interests guarded by appointing three councilmen members of the board of directors. Birmingham publishes in its reports a table showing the amount of profits paid annually to the city by its gas consumers, amounting in ten years to $2,500,000; the Sheffield Company could well print a table showing, on the basis of the difference between the price of its gas and Birmingham's, how it has saved twice that sum to Sheffield's gas consumers, meantime taking nothing

from the municipality and maintaining an attitude of impartial justice toward all citizens, gas consumers or otherwise. Sheffield and Birmingham thus compared afford an insight into certain peculiar and significant features of municipal and private ownership, not the least of which are the fitfulness of municipalization reform and the permanency in the reforms established by just charter provisions for a company, to the immeasurable benefit of the entire wage working class.

The summing-up questions in our labor inquiry must include, besides those relating strictly to the wages and hours and welfare of the hands: Which, public or private employment, assists in the greater honesty and efficiency of a working force, in the higher development of both specialized knowledge and the spirit of manhood among employees? Which promotes among the masses the more general use of the commodities that are produced? Which, hence, best aids commerce and transportation? Which, while helping to insure the greatest possible volume of consumption, unfailingly stimulates initiative and invention and provides new opportunities for the workers through the advancement of the whole people? Civic adjustments with a view to benefiting labor must have regard to clearing the political and economic field of unnecessary complications, to maintaining the conditions most favorable to technical and general progress, and to achieving results in the highest, broadest and remotest degree conducive to the happiness of every rank of labor. The adjustments, for example, that give us the most widespread use of the best and cheapest gas and electricity, the lowest fares and the speediest transportation on the greatest of electric lines, are those most desirable to the entire population. If such ends are the better attained in free industry, necessarily involving private employment, to continue extending its province becomes one of the higher obligations of society.

On examining municipalization as exhibited in the labor reports, it is seen to be a project to restrict men in their activities by methods foreign to the American genius, while in practice it has failed to make out the case of its advocates as in the least measure a step forward in promoting the best interests of the employees of the enterprises investigated, or of the occupations most closely interwoven with them, or of the nation's breadwinning masses.

WORKING CLASS CONDITIONS.

Many of the striking differences between the United States and Great Britain in labor and social conditions are illustrated in the industries investigated. In the United States there is an absence of many factors which, appearing in the inquiry in Great Britain, possess a significance as to the general political and economic state of the kingdom, and consequently as to tendencies there in attempts at social changes.

There is no Municipal Employees' Association in the United States. The essential object of that organization—pressure on city officials by means of the ballot to control wages and hours—

is usually attained here through the composition and methods of our party machines. It is through them that our officeholders, big and little, and outside organizations, labor and otherwise operate.

In this country a community may have the three interests of local, State, and national politics united in one party executive committee; in Great Britain representative men of all the cities visited denied that any machine whatever in the American sense existed among them. In some of these cities any connection between local and national politics was also disavowed, and even where Councillors were classed as Liberals and Conservatives at election it was asserted that in Council Conservatives at times spoke and acted as Radicals, while Liberals might be as reactionary as the Whigs.

In the United States, there are nowhere such legal restrictions of citizenship as to cut away the laboring class vote by 25 per cent, or at times more, even as high as 40, as in London and Liverpool. Nor does there exist in this country such a relationship between municipality as employer and its wage-workers as to bring up for discussion the disenfranchisement of city employees. There are no multiple voting here on property, no representation by citizens living in territory lying outside the constituency represented, no selection of men of other classes as the official spokesman of the labor element. The American workmen have no conception of the British system of caste. In America there has been no recent upheaval of the working classes resulting in the election of labor representation in Congress and the City Councils composed of leaders with more or less revolutionary programmes.

The three foregoing paragraphs indicate either that the professional politician of Great Britain has not awakened to his opportunities or that the opportunities do not exist. In either event that country has been barren ground for the boss, the heeler, the gang, and a mass of purchaseable voters represented in legislative bodies by a machine man. Further, our workingmen reformers have a different political outlook before them and different materials to work on from those of the British workingmen reformers.

The relations between trade unions and the municipality differ in the two countries:

In Great Britain a definite policy in dealing with the trade unionists has been adopted by managers of municipal undertakings; in this country, except in Chicago, where some of the objects of the unions are attained in a roundabout manner, the municipalities have given union officers no recognition in negotiating.

In America, neither public nor private managers have put into practice a system of making individual contracts with employees to forestall strikes, as is done in the public Glasgow and the private London South Metropolitan Gas Works; nor in this country has any system of pensioning or labor copartnership been adopted.

In Great Britain whatever important changes in pay and hours have taken place have been in connection with the municipal tramway employees and the most poorly paid laborers protected by the

"minimum wage"; in the United States all the street and interurban railways are owned and operated by companies, under whom marked changes for the better have also taken place, while day laborers' wages, usually double or nearly double those of Great Britain, are little affected by the municipal minimum.

In the municipalities of Great Britain there are no civil service regulations, as in Chicago, nor a general "prevailing rate" law, as in New York and Pennsylvania.

Socialism and trade unionism are closer together in Great Britain than in America.

In America Socialism has had no direct bearing on the development of the municipal enterprises investigated; in Great Britain prominent trade-union Socialists assert that the whole municipal ownership movement of the kingdom has been brought about by Socialist agitation.

Those American trade unions whose ramifications enter into the four industries investigated have no Socialist platforms and publications, as do the unions of the laborers, gas workers and electrical workers of Great Britain. The American labor movement is overwhelmingly embodied in trade-unionism, with first reliance on the strike, a method which has here done the uplifting; the British trade union with respect to its every-day labors is a benefit society, and with respect to its occasional militant efforts is nowadays the main support of Socialistic tendencies. A general strike in recent years has been a rarity.

In education and democracy the American masses are immeasurably ahead.

The British workingman ever since the kingdom's tardy establishment of a school system has been the victim of crude and often sectarian educational methods, the removal of some of its abuses in the course of a series of political campaigns being recently attended with prolonged acrimonious public debate and the display of religious animosities. America long ago settled this question in peace.

In Great Britain, the influences of the outgrown established church, of the feudal-minded nobility, of the bauble-distributing monarchy, and above all of landlordism, constantly irritate, hamper or impoverish the masses. In America no one or two men draw ground rent from half or two-thirds a city or a borough, as do two lords of the kingdom in Liverpool, or the Dukes of Bedford and Westminster in London.

The extremely narrow limits to the opportunities of the masses in Great Britain is to the American observer a fact most striking. Unemployment in America is not condemnation to hopelessness; pauperism is not the common lot of a large percentage of the aged working people.

The objects of trade unionism in the two countries differ:

In Great Britain the composite organization of tramway workers, teamsters and drivers of all sorts has a total membership of only 12,000. In two of the largest municipal un-

dertakings investigated the workmen's organizations are benefit societies under the wing of the managers. The Electrical Workers' Union was called into being to capture the work of contractors on city work; its bond to maintain its continuity is made up of benefits; its organ, pessimistic and visionary in contents, is weighted with the propaganda of Socialism. Among the unskilled, however, mutual benefit trade unionism has made a progress that is illustrated by the existence in the small area of England of five national laborers' organizations, each supporting a staff of general officers. In none of the American enterprises investigated were the laborers organized, a difference in the social composition of the two countries being suggested by the fact that the innumerable American benefit societies are rarely up on occupational lines and that the feature of paying benefits is by many American union leaders regarded as a drawback to the more profitable venture of striking for higher wages and lower hours. A union without benefits and for striking purposes only would be allowed to languish by the British workers. Their chances for winning strikes are small, unemployment being so general now for years. Their minds are bent on a plodding routine of insurance in a state of chronic distress rather than on mastering the labor market in order to take as a right a larger share of an increasing national production.

British workmen in the mass earn hardly as much money as our Southern negroes:

A wide difference in the standard of earnings for the wage working classes of the United States and Great Britain is indicated in the wage scales of the undertakings investigated in the two countries. In Glasgow the minimum municipal wage, for which thousands are working, is 21s. ($5.09) a week; in Birmingham, 23s. ($5.57); in Liverpool, 24s. ($5.81); in Manchester, 25s. ($6.07; in London, 28s. ($6.80). These are the rates up to which the radical reformers in the largest and most advanced cities have pushed the municipal scale for laborers, men without special skill but who are selected after proof of character and capability. The run of the human market, as taken by private employers in general, falls for the same class of laborers to 3s. or even 5s. less per week. But in the company undertakings investigated the average minimum ran little below that of the municipal. The other extreme of the wage range, the maximum, is reached by the trade union scales for skilled mechanics, which settles at 32s. to 34s. a week in Northeastern England, where, except in London, the highest rates are recorded, and only a shade more is earned in London itself. Turning to labor in the American municipal enterprises investigated, we find the lowest point for common white labor at $1.50 to $2 a day in Syracuse, $2.75 in Allegheny, $1.85 in Wheeling, $1.75 in Cleveland, $1.75 in Detroit, $2 in Chicago, and $2 in Richmond. In the private enterprises, the cheapest grade of labor draws $1.75 in Philadelphia, $1.50 in New Haven, $1.60 and $1.80 in Indianapolis, $2 in Chicago, and $1 (negroes) in Atlanta. The weekly range of this grade for the municipalities in Great Britain is from

$5.09 to $6.80; in America from $9 to $12 (omitting the exceptionally high rate of $16.50 in Allegheny). The company range is just the same (omitting the Atlanta rate for negroes). In the United Kingdom the company rate runs better than the municipalities in the gas works at Sheffield and Newcastle and in the South Metropolitan works in London, while it is slightly lower in Norwich and Dublin, with a wider difference between the municipal and company systems in London.

Living is cheaper in Great Brtain only when the poor people go without things that all classes of Americans can have.

A member of the Manchester City Council Committee on Tramways, speaking formally at a joint meeting of his committee and the National Civic Federation Committee on Investigation, said that to the working man £1 in England was worth £2 in America, owing to the difference in the cost of living. He repeated a belief common among the uninformed in England.

On this very large subject, the reader is aware, exact facts are frequently elusive, and opinions as to what exhaustive inquiry might elicit may with reason differ. Trustworthy definitive statistics are not to be had. Yet not to publish one's own reading of the simpler facts in view, and not to give one's own conclusions as to the more complex phenomena so far as formed, would leave a duty unfulfilled.

In what is herewith submitted, the reader will discriminate between the facts which are undoubted and the impressions which await correction.

Of the four principal items of the married workingman's outlay, food, rent, clothing and fuel, the first is the most important. It is usually allotted in our National Labor Department tables, on an average, 50 to 65 per cent. of a year's earnings. Exportations of American grain stuffs, meats, etc., to Great Britain, it is plain, can be disposed of in the United States at no more than the British market prices. In other words, if prices were higher in America, the farm products exported would be held here for the home market. To maintain a volume of exportation, the British prices must be the American producer's price plus the costs of resale and shipment to the British merchant. In the first four months of 1906 the United Kingdom imported from America 176,000 head of live cattle, 820,000 hundredweight of beef, 42,000 head of live sheep, 1,500,000 hundredweight of bacon, 400,000 hundredweight of hams, with butter, cheese, and eggs in quantities, and fruit by the shipload. This was not trust-owned output dumped abroad cheap, but commodities sold under competition. The British workingman can obviously in these circumstances not buy these staples of life at lower prices than the American. As a matter of fact, the foods of the British masses, aside from bread, are mostly made up of dried fish, cheap meats, and the common kinds of vegetables. Much the same things go on the table the year round. Fruit is usually dear, even in the short season of the British Isles. In variety, quantity and quality, the articles of food sold to-day in Britain's markets bear no com-

parison with those in the American. The British working classes ordinarily live on the poor grades of the market or go without. As to clothing, whatever verdict might once have been declared off-hand favorable to English goods and make, American observers at present may with reason ask to hear from American clothing and shoe manufacturers on the subject before the question is settled in their minds. Within the last twenty years the improvement in quality of cloth and trimmings, in cut and fit, of the American workingman's clothes has been one of the most notable changes in the outcome of any industry. The suit selling at $20 or more in England is usually of better cloth than one of the same price in the United States, but the eight or ten dollar American suit, made under a system of manufacture as to which the English have much to learn, is of the same grade of cloth as the English and of superior make. American shoes are sold in every city of England; American furniture, much cheaper than English, is on the market. Again, in these respects the British working classes buy sparingly as compared with Americans of the same occupations. They wear one suit at work and on the street for years, with a two-shilling cap instead of a two-dollar derby. Their habitations are noticeably bare of furniture. It is significant that while in England the slot gas meter is adjusted for a penny in America it takes the workingman's quarter, and there is no mechanical difficulty in adjusting it for a shilling or even a sixpence. As to rents, there is as much difference in cost and grade of housing between English cities as between English and American cities, and the differences between American cities seem to baffle general comparisons. Further differences are introduced in this country by its three classes of working men—the American born, the immigrants, and the negroes. On this question, general averages of many local averages are liable to be deceptive, and quotation of particular examples cannot give the inquirer satisfaction. But the overcrowding common in cities of Great Britain—the tens of thousands in Glasgow, Liverpool, and London living a family of three to ten persons in a room, the hundreds of thousands in all the Kingdom living a family in two rooms—is unknown among white Americans. There are cities in Great Britain in which slum life is the fate of the majority of the workers. In the Glasgow gas works meter repair workroom, where 100 men were at work, the trade union speaker for the hands said that more than 90 per cent. of them lived with their families in one room and a kitchen. When the low rent of the British workingman is mentioned it commonly connotes a neighborhood and an environment that to an average American would be unendurable. Moreover, what the tenant gets differs vastly in the two countries. An American's ideas of the requirements of a dwelling place are more exacting than an English workingman's. And when all is said, the actual outlay for a wage-worker's housing in Great Britain, having regard to number of rooms, appointments, house space and yard space, is not at a percentage so much lower as to impress the American who knows the variations existing in his own land. Last summer, Miss Octavia

Hill opened up in an improved area in Southwark, London, several blocks of rows of cottages in which eight hundred families were to be accommodated. The rents for flats in these houses ran from 5s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. per week, or about $7 to $12 a month; five-room cottages were held at $18 a month. A similar scale of housing can be had in Philadelphia at much the same rates. For the better grade of cottages at Cadbury's Bourneville the rents do not seem low to an American acquainted with the average rents of the smaller cities of New England and Pennsylvania.

One item in the outlay of the British workingman, taken in the mass, British statisticians report, exceeds by 50 per cent. that of the American workingman, taken in the mass. It is drink. That plain water is not a table drink is a prevailing national sentiment in Great Britain. The most popular and usually the only meeting centre for the men in British factory towns is the public house. Restaurant meals almost invariably include a drink other than pure water. This habit of the British nation must be taken into account in estimating the cost of living.

The American wageworkers are inspired by hope; the British wageworkers are commonly not.

In traveling from place to place in the United States and mingling among the wageworkers, the observer frequently hears references to achievements in the lives of laboring men formerly neighbors, or once of the very circle present, which convey an impression of a society that, whatever the struggles of the mass, sees constant changes of large numbers of individuals for the better. In Great Britain little of the talk runs this way. America has space, and the workers move about in it continually; it has cheap land, readily transferable, in suburb or country, East or West; it has colleges and universities at which many of the students are earning their way; it has enormous numbers of wageworkers buying their own homes, separately or in association; it has democracy in politics, and numberless openings for a political career, worthy or unworthy. In all these regards, Britain differs greatly as to degree if not wholly as to kind. The British workman travels little, cannot buy a farm or take free a homestead; he rarely gets to college, and he regards a professional or business career as ordinarily beyond his dreams. The confirmed attitude of the British workman toward life is discouragement; the tone of his conversation, the interpretation of his spirit, is despondency. Not yet can this be said of the American workingman.

Poverty in Great Britain has reached the point at which it is affrighting the nation. London alone had 140,000 paupers last year. It has 70,000 to 80,000 "lodgers." The general physical deterioration of Englishmen is shown in the repeated reductions of the army standard of height. The London Daily Standard, July 5 last, said: "The upshot amounts to this, that the poor quarters in all our great cities have become reeking, overcrowded hives of only partially employed, underfed, and rapidly degenerating men and women, from whom fate and their own action, destiny and the con-

ditions of their life seem to have removed all rights, and all power, save the continuance and reproduction of their downward-tending species." The number of emigrants last year from Britain was 270,000, nearly every one driven out by the menace of poverty. In addition to the usual appropriations for the 800,000 paupers of the Kingdom, $440,000 was spent last year under the Unemployed Workmen act, the sum this year being made $1,000,000, while the amount to be given by the local authorities and the charitable for the same purpose was expected to reach possibly $1,000,000 more. Eighty-nine distress committees had been set up last year throughout the country. It is a generally accepted custom among the poor people to allow their parents to go to the workhouse during hard times. The trade union minimum wage for England in general outside London is $5.81 per week. The Italian swarms of laborers, who can compete with the negroes, and who underwork the Russian Jews in New York factories, have never attempted to get a footing in England. A tenth of the present immigration to the United States would precipitate in Great Britain a national disorder.

In their distressing situation many English wageworkers are ready to embrace any economic movement that promises even a small fraction of them relief. Victims of desperate social diseases, they have grasped at desperate social remedies. The trade unions being driven into political action through the Taff Vale decision, many of the working classes in general were stampeded on in among the Socialists. Their present economic tendencies find origin in their life-long heartrending distress, in their pent-up existence, in the opportunities presented by the expiration of franchises, and in the work of social theorists who are the product of political and economic conditions unknown in America, and whose teachings make little headway with the American masses and have been rejected time and again at the conventions of the American Federation of Labor.

LABOR AND POLITICS

By JOHN R. COMMONS

In summarizing the report which Mr. Sullivan and I have made on political and labor conditions in America and Great Britain,[1] it is impossible for me to pick out the sentences here and there favorable to municipal ownership and to discredit the sentences favorable to private ownership. I shall take the report as a whole, and shall try to bring together all of the facts exactly as they are and in their true proportions.[2] In order that my position may be more clearly understood I will say in advance that neither municipal ownership nor private ownership have accomplished the good results in the United States that should be expected of them,[3] and both are far behind what both have accomplished in Great Britain. I attribute this backwardness mainly to the infancy of the movement for municipal ownership in the United States. The American people have never seriously studied in detail the financial, political, administrative and labor conditions necessary to make municipal ownership a success, because they have never had thrown upon them the responsibility and necessity of making it a success. The question has not yet been big enough to attract attention, and all the energies of the people in municipal government have been consumed in fighting the private corporations which have possession.[4] We are in precisely the same position that British municipalities occupied 40 years ago in the gas business and 15 to 30 years ago in the street car and electricity business.[5] And the two most noticeable facts regarding the movement in Great Britain are the steady improvement made in municipal operation after municipal ownership had passed the fighting stage and had become a settled policy, and also the great improvement in private ownership and operation during the same period. In comparing the two countries, I have been impressed by this fact more than anything else, that successful private operation follows successful municipal operation. The private companies in Great Britain have learned to accept and act upon a view of their public obligations which we have found to be utterly foreign and inconceivable to the managers of similar private undertakings in the United States. This is seen most strikingly in the fact that the British companies were willing that our engineers should make a physical valuation of their properties for comparison with their capitalization and their earnings, whereas the American companies would not permit such a valuation.[6] Many of the British companies also for years have been subject to com-

plete publicity of their accounts and examination of their books by public auditors and accountants, thus furnishing information that we are not able to get in America. This kind of information is essential both from the standpoint of the prices paid by consumers and that of the wages paid to employees, because it enables us to know whether prices are as low and wages are as high as the companies can reasonably afford. Another instance of the higher view of their obligations held by British companies is the many precautions they have taken to conciliate their employees and to prevent the necessity of strikes. In every case this higher view has come about because the companies have before them the menace of municipal ownership if they do not live up to their public obligations.[7] They cannot afford to have strikes, because they would at once arouse into action the demand for municipal ownership. They cannot afford to keep their accounts private, because in order to head off municipal ownership they must let the people know just how much profit they are making.[8] The consequence is that many of the vices which we have found in private ownership in the United States and which were formerly found in Great Britain have been largely eliminated in that country.[9] And at the same time the vices and crudities of municipal ownership which we have found in the United States have been largely eliminated in Great Britain through experience and through the accurate comparison which can always be made with private ownership.

With these preliminary observations, it will be seen that in weighing and interpreting the facts,[10] I cannot, as an offset to the summary prepared by my colleague, confine myself simply to the facts that discredit private ownership and exalt municipal ownership, but I must summarize all of the facts. In doing so,[11] my interpretation requires that at least for some time to come, both private ownership and municipal ownership be carried along side by side in the same country; that each municipality have full power and home rule to change from one to the other according to its judgment of which it is that offers the better results in the given case; and that in this way the defects of both municipal and private ownership in the United States may be gradually eliminated and both may be brought to the higher level occupied by both in Great Britain.

MONOPOLIES AND POLITICS.

I take it that the key to the whole question of municipal or private ownership is the question of politics.[12] For politics is simply the question of getting and keeping the right kind of men to manage and operate the municipal undertakings, or to supervise, regulate and bargain with the private undertakings. The kinds of business that we are dealing with are essentially monopolies performing a public service, and are compelled to make use of the streets which are public property. If their owners are private companies they are compelled to get their franchises and all privileges of doing business, and all terms and conditions of service from the municipal authorities. And in carrying out their contract with the

municipality they are dealing continually with municipal officials. Consequently it is absurd to assume that private ownership is non-political. It is just as much a political question to get and keep honest or business-like municipal officials who will drive good bargains with private companies on behalf of the public and then see that the bargains are lived up to, as it is to get similar officials to operate a municipal plant. We do not escape politics by resorting to private ownership—we only get a different kind of practical politics.

Since these businesses are monopolies of public service and must make use of public property, the question of municipal ownership is entirely different from that of other kinds of business. A private business that has no dealings with municipal officials and is regulated by competition, has no place in this investigation except by way of contrast.[13] We have found that this difference between the two kinds of business is not always appreciated by certain classes. These are the socialists and the public utility corporations. The socialists are opposed to private competition in any form and would extend public ownership to all kinds of business. The public utility corporations and their defenders naturally seize upon this position of the socialists to confuse the issues respecting their own kind of business. The public at large is misled for a time until the distinction comes to be one of practical importance. This attitude of the several parties to the controversy was most clearly brought to our attention in Glasgow, where public ownership has been extended to all of the businesses occupying the streets. Following the municipal tramways of 1894, many projects were brought forward for further municipalization, including banking, housing, insurance, tailoring and baking. Councillors were elected favorable to these proposals, and the voters, inspired by the remarkable success of the tramways, were not critical in their inspection of these new enterprises which the council was contemplating. In the midst of this socialistic tide, two anti-municipal ownership associations were organized—the Citizens' Union and the Rate-Payers' Federation. They started an active agitation, and, along with other influences, the tide of municipalization has been checked or stopped. We were led to believe that from these two associations we could secure information that would correct the universal endorsement of municipal ownership found elsewhere in Glasgow,[14] but were surprised to find that both associations endorsed all that had been done in municipalizing tramways, electricity, gas, and water. They only opposed the municipalization of other undertakings competitive in character. No more conclusive endorsement of the success of municipal ownership in Glasgow could have been brought to our attention, but at the same time nothing more conclusive could be offered to show that the general public cannot be permanently deceived by the fallacy of the socialists and the dodge of the franchise corporations in confusing competitive business with monopolistic public-service business. The essential difference is that the public-service business is in politics, whether operated by

a private company or by a municipality, but the competitive business does not depend on politicians for its profits.

At this point I am unhappily compelled to put in a word of personal explanation as to the facts brought out in our investigations.[15] I do this with the greatest reluctance and only because my colleague has seen fit to discredit or disclaim those portions of our report which deal with the political activity of public-service corporations. The personal explanation required is to the effect that I investigated thoroughly, or, as he says, "sifted the back-stairs and dark-room talk down to substantial truth," both of the political activities of municipal undertakings and the political activities of private undertakings;[16] and the entire report as it stands, except New Haven and Philadelphia, was written by myself on the basis of facts which I personally investigated. I have set forth in complete detail the political facts regarding municipal operation, to which he confines his summary, and have also set forth in the same way the political facts regarding private operation. Both are backed by the same thoroughness of investigation,[17] and I am as positive of the facts stated in the one case as in the other.

POLITICAL EMPLOYEES.

This can be tested by the situation of the Wheeling gas works. The secretary of the Wheeling Gas Trustees, quoted by my colleague as testifying to the political rottenness of the municipal gas works, is the same man who testified to the political rottenness of the private gas, electricity and street car companies of that locality. Instead of relying on his statements, I interviewed a large number of officials, politicians, business men, employees and others, and checked up his statements respecting both the gas works and the corporations. This shows that while the gas works are in politics, the public-service corporations are also in politics.[18] The gas employees take part in the primaries of the Republican party and the motormen and conductors of the street car companies are given leave of absence on pay to work in the primaries of both the Republican and Democratic parties. Even the officers of the street railway employees' union take part in this kind of traction politics on behalf of their employees. The councilmen and aldermen nominated and elected in this way control the municipal gas works and they control the franchises and contracts of the private companies. The "City Hall Ring" is just as much a ring of the political tools of the private corporations as it is a ring of municipal politicians. To pick out the politics of the gas works and not to see that it is bound up with the politics of the private corporations would be a perverse and one-sided method of investigation. The report gives not selected facts, but all of the facts in the situation.[19] Indeed, the secretary of the Wheeling Gas Trustees, in his indignation towards the political management of the gas works, referred to by my colleague, was defeated in the Republican primaries by the motormen and conductors of the street car company on leave of absence as political workers.

In cities other than Wheeling the convention system prevails instead of the direct primaries, and consequently it was not found that the wage earners of the private companies took a similar active part in political campaigns. But in Syracuse, Allegheny Indianapolis and Philadelphia, where municipal employees are named by politicians, it was found also that street car, electric, gas and water companies had employed men on the recommendation of councilmen, mayor or chairman of a political committee.[20] This practice was carried furthest by the street car companies of Syracuse and Allegheny. In Chicago, where a most rigid civil service law is enforced, no evidence of political appointments could be found in the municipal electricity or water departments during recent years, but men were hired on recommendation of aldermen by the private electrical companies at the time when their contracts were before the council for renewal.

There is a distinction which has been found in all of these cases between political appointments in municipal undertakings and political appointments by franchise corporations.[21] The alderman or mayor who secures the appointment of a political supporter on a municipal job exerts himself just as much to retain that man in his job as he did to get the appointment for him. But both he and his supporters take a different view when the appointment is secured with a street railway, gas or electric company. The alderman then says, "I get the job for you, but you must make good; I cannot keep the job for you; the company has the right to discharge you if you don't do your work." It is for this reason that the private company has an advantage over the municipal management under the spoils system, for it can get rid of a political appointee after trying him out and finding him inefficient. This explains also why it is that the employees of a franchise corporation, even though they get their appointments through politicians, are nevertheless found to take an active part in organizing themselves in a trade union, but where they depend on the politicians for retaining their jobs and improving their wages and conditions they do not look to a union for protection. Where the politicians' support stops after appointment, as in a private undertaking, they are more likely to protect themselves by organizing a union. The result is similar in a municipal undertaking when civil service reform releases the employee from depending on a politician. The trade unions in Chicago have no difficulty in organizing the workmen who have been appointed through the Civil Service Commission, but they are not able to get the "hold-overs" who came in through political pull.

Curiously enough, the politician profits more in some respects by the appointments which he secures for his supporters with a franchise company than he does by those on municipal jobs. Since all parties understand that the alderman's influence stops after appointment, there is no ill feeling on the part of his supporter if he is discharged. He and his family and friends continue to be the supporters of the alderman who has done his best for them, and

his discharge at the same time makes room for the alderman to name another man who also with his family and friends become supporters. It is different in municipal employment, where it is expected that the politician who gets the job for his follower will keep it for him. If he is removed from that job he loses confidence in the ability or good faith of the politician. On account of these differences in the attitude of workmen, politicians and managers, the private corporation in politics is more efficient from the standpoint of its stockholders than the municipal undertaking in politics, and at the same time the capable politician can build up his organization just as effectively under one system as under the other.[22] Where civil service rules are enforced, as in the Chicago Electric and Water departments, this political influence is excluded, but there is no way of preventing a private corporation from hiring its employees on the recommendation of a politician.

There are other differences which operate to the advantages of the private corporation. Its employees are more minutely specialized, and a few positions of a permanent, semi-political character are created which are kept distinct from the technical and administrative positions, whereas in the municipal undertaking, without civil service rules, a larger proportion of the positions are likely to be semi-political. The municipal undertaking is compelled to keep a few sub-managers, foremen and inspectors who are familiar with the layout of the plant and distributing system, and such positions have been found to be permanent, while the other positions are subject to political vicissitude. In the private corporations investigated the political positions are found not so much in the operating department as in the legal department and among the directors, presidents, and highest officials.[23] These make the bargains directly, by means of a cash consideration or otherwise, with the political managers. Only where nominations are made by direct primaries, as in Wheeling, has it been found that the rank and file of the employees are retained on account of this political influence.

Under the convention system of nominations the principal activity of private corporations was found to be that of contributions to the expenses of campaign committees and candidates. It is difficult to see that it is necessarily dishonorable or corrupt for any citizen to contribute according to his ability toward the expenses of his political party in conducting a campaign. The education of the voters respecting the issues is of the greatest importance and requires corresponding expenditures. But for some reason these contributions are looked upon as strictly confidential, and it was only through the accident of my personal acquaintance with certain participants in Syracuse and Indianapolis that any information on the point was given to me. This shows a contribution of $2,000 in Syracuse by two directors of the gas company to the Democratic campaign committee, in a municipal election. It shows contributions at Indianapolis by the water company in the municipal campaign of 1903 of $300, and in 1905 of $1,500 to the Democratic committee, and in 1905 of $5,000 to the Repub-

lican committee. In 1905 the street car company paid $10,000 to the Republican committee, and $2,000 to the Democratic committee, and the gas company paid $17,000 to the Republican committee. The Republican administration, elected in 1905, has to deal with important franchises and contracts renewable during its term. Professor Gray's investigations of the New Haven water company show that the president of the common council which granted a perpetual franchise to the company was one of the company's own employees and that the company expended $20,457.44 to get this franchise through the council and the legislature, in addition to the fees of $1,498.89 paid to the regular counsel for drawing up the contract.

EFFICIENCY OF MUNICIPAL OPERATION.

Whatever weakens or corrupts city government in its admitted duties of protecting the health, property, life and morals of its citizens also weakens or corrupts it in operating public utilities or in regulating the private operation of those utilities. We cannot separate the question of municipal or private operation from the question of honest and efficient city government in every other department. The municipal corporation is a unit, and the supply of either water, gas, electricity or transportation is only a single department of its work, and is good or bad to the same extent that the other departments of police, fire, health, parks and taxes are good or bad. When we investigate the politics and labor of these four public utilities we are investigating the whole question of municipal government. If the conditions are such that the city does not operate or regulate these utilities satisfactorily, we find that it does not do anything else satisfactorily. This fact is abundantly demonstrated when we take up one by one the several factors that go to make up the total political life of a city.

First is the suffrage. In all of the Northern cities of the United States the suffrage is on the universal manhood basis. In the Southern cities it is restricted by education or poll-tax requirements, and in British cities by tenant, lodger and household limitations. These restrictions bear most heavily on the wage-earning classes, amounting to the exclusion of one-fourth to two-fifths of the wage-earners. But the classes excluded are the casual and irregular laborers, the pauperized and indifferent workers, the hoodlum and hooligan elements. These are mainly the unorganized laborers, so that in England the trade unions have the field to themselves more than they have in the United States for entering upon a political movement. They are not compelled to make alliances with political bosses who know how to get these unorganized voters. In two Northern cities, Indianapolis and Syracuse, definite information was obtained of bribery of the voters. In Indianapolis the bribable voters are largely the colored element of the town, and in Syracuse the hoodlum, immigrant and colored element of the downtown precincts. Among these voters a large part of the campaign contributions is distributed.[24]

Next to the suffrage are the qualifications of the councillors, aldermen and city officials. In the British cities only the councillors are elected, one each year, holding three years for each ward. The councillors elect the aldermen and the city officials. Most important of all, the councillors and aldermen are not required to live in the wards they represent, and many of them live in the suburbs. One-half to four-fifths of the councillors and aldermen live outside the wards they represent, and the proportion is strikingly larger in the working-class wards, which elect two-thirds to nine-tenths of their councillors from outside. Many inquiries were made as to the reasons, on the part of voters, for this indifference as to the place of residence of their candidates, and the explanation that seems adequate is the absence of campaign and corruption funds and the inability of councillors to find jobs for their constituents. The councillor in Glasgow who is most active in pressing for jobs in the municipal service lives in the ward which he represents, among constituents in need of employment. Furthermore, councillors and aldermen are unsalaried. This freedom of choice makes it possible to elect both the leading business men and the leading labor men to govern the city. Not only do we find eminent bankers, financiers and employers of labor in the councils, but we find the secretaries and officials of trade unions, most of them living outside the wards they represent. The absence of such leaders and truly representative men from American city councils is the most discouraging fact brought to our attention.[25] We have not found any of the leading business men corresponding to those in British cities. The largest delegation of wage-earners which we found was in the city of Wheeling, where they number fourteen, but not one of them was an official or representative of a trade-union, although the unions are stronger in Wheeling than in the other places visited. There the wage-earning councillors were largely the employees of corporations whose owners were interested in the public utility corporations. Their campaign expenses were paid from those sources, and their successful qualities were those of a good "mixer" with the voters and obedience to their employers in casting their votes as councilmen. In other cities not provided with the direct primary system of nominations there were practically no wage-earners in the council.

In American cities the form of organization has been found to be most complicated. Authority and responsibility are scattered here and there in a mayor, a commission, a superintendent, a council, a committee of the council, or even two committees, sometimes a joint committee of two branches of the council, a civil service commission, and so on. The finances and accounts of municipal undertakings are mixed with those of other departments. Scarcely any system that we have investigated would for a moment be recognized as satisfactory for an effective business management.[26] The voters are unable to tell who is responsible or what exactly are the financial results. The one pre-eminent advantage of private operation is centralized control by one man, subject to a board of

directors. This is also the form of organization of the British cities, where a committee of the council takes the place of the board of directors, and the manager, selected by the committee, holds his position not for a fixed term but permanently, or until removed. The American system most nearly corresponding is the commission system of South Norwalk and Detroit, which permits the selection of men from any part of the city and retains a number of them when others drop out.

The foregoing statements refer only to the legal or formal organization of British and American cities. The real political influences behind this formal organization are found in the conflicting interests of the voters who elect or control the city officials. In both countries the interests that are most important in deciding the results are those of the saloon-keepers, real estate owners, political parties, trade unions, municpal employees, business classes, contractors and franchise corporations.

In both countries the saloons, known in England as the "public house," or "pub," are regulated by the municipal council.[27] This compels them in self protection to take a part in politics. In some places, like Glasgow, their candidates make a pretense of standing for workingmen, and they appeal to the labor vote in support of labor measures in the council. In other places like Liverpool the large brewery interests enter the field as capitalists, and elect their partners to the council. In American cities the saloon interest is an important wheel of the political machine. In any case their candidates are elected, not for the sake of efficient government, but really in order to weaken the government that endeavors to regulate their private business.

Much less evidence was found of real estate dealers and speculators in British cities than in American cities. Owing perhaps to the system of landed property and the jealousy of the landed interest, real estate speculation is very quiet and subdued in British cities. The councils, outside London, are almost exclusively of the commercial, manufacturing, profession and labor classes. The purchase and sale of sites either by a council or by a company, and the selection of routes, are so jealously controlled by the landed interest intrenched in the House of Lords, that land speculation in connection with public utilities does not greatly influence the local councils.

In all of the cities visited in Great Britain, except Glasgow and London, it was found that national political parties managed the municipal elections. The exception in Glasgow is mainly owing to the fact that there the Liberal party is so overwhelming that the Tories have no chance. Even the committees that manage the municipal undertakings are selected so that the dominant party of the council has majorities. In two places, however, Leicester and Birmingham, an eminent financier of the opposite party is elected to the head of the finance committee. Party politics in itself is not a barrier to successful municipal operation.

The part taken by the working classes in the election of councillors in England is divided into two stages. The few labor members elected ten to twenty years ago came in as members of the Liberal party and they retain that allegiance. They are first Liberals and secondarily trade unionists. The second stage is that of the Labor party of the past five years, in which the trade unions have joined with one wing of the socialists.[28] The object of the Labor party has been that of getting legislation to protect the funds of trade unions from attachment by the courts. It has, however, organized local branches for municipal elections. Much the largest number of candidates put up by the Labor party are the salaried officials of the unions, who, if elected, retain their union position. They are not usually "organizers" or "agitators," for the British unions do not have such salaried positions, but they are the official secretaries who are at the same time the experienced negotiators with employers. A much smaller class of so-called "labor councillors" are the socialists, who are generally small merchants, employers or professional men, with a program more radical than that of the trade-unionists. Finally, there were found a half dozen political adventurers of the "fakir" type, not nominated by the Labor party, but taken up by the Liberals, Tories or public-house interests to draw off the vote of the Labor party. In general, while some criticism was heard from aged councillors or from old-line trade-union Liberals, to the effect that the new labor movement was deteriorating the character of the councils, yet the criticism was confined to the lack of business and financial capacity, to the inability to take "broad" views of municipal business, and to the efforts to find municipal work for applicants. With the exception of the half dozen adventurers, no criticism is made of their integrity or earnestness and sincerity of purpose in urging the cause they advocate; while in the case of the trade-union officials there was a general agreement on the part of all classes that they brought a kind of intelligence and a point of view that was needed in the council's deliberations as a large employer of labor.

ORGANIZATIONS OF MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.

The increase in municipal ownership in Great Britain has, of course, brought an increase in the number of municipal employees, and this has caused apprehension in certain quarters. Generally the chief officers of the municipal enterprises take the ground that they and other employees should not vote in municipal elections, and they openly set that example to their subordinates.[29] Some of them go even so far as to advocate the disfranchisement of municipal employees in municipal elections. This has also been advocated by some of the councillors. However, such a proposition is no longer seriously considered. If the vote of municipal employees is a menace the remedy must be looked for in directions other than disfranchisement. It goes without proof that such a remedy is needed,[30] for municipal employees sooner or later cast their votes for candidates who promise or have secured a betterment of their con-

dition, regardless of its effect on the enterprise as a whole. Omitting disfranchisement, there are two directions in which such a remedy can be found, first a limit to be set beyond which municipalization shall not go, and second, the attitude of the public and especially of the workmen in private employment.

Although there are doctrinaire and socialistic elements that set no limit to public ownership, the overwhelming sentiment of those now in control of the municipal councils places a limit at the point already reached by cities like Glasgow, Manchester, and Leicester. With this practical agreement there is no prospect that the number of municipal employees will be materially increased beyond the proportion reached in Glasgow, where their voting strength is possibly one-sixteenth of the total. The total number employed by the London County Council and the London Borough Councils is about one-fourteenth of the registered voters.[31]

The natural tendency of municipal employees to better their own condition by use of their political strength is seen in the growth of the Municipal Employees' Association. This is a spurious form of trade unionism which has sprung up with the growth of municipalization, and nothing of its kind has been found among American unions. It has gained affiliation with other unions in the Trades Union Congress and in local Trades Councils. Its platform is simple enough: to prohibit strikes, to oppose councillors at the polls if they stand in the way of granting its demands, and to call on other unions for help in the elections. Its demands are in excess of anything that other unions have been able to secure from private employers or even from municipal corporations. It invites into membership all employees of municipalities, and since they are nearly all eligible to other unions, evidently the aim of this organization is to separate a privileged class of workmen, and to do this through the political power of those whom they abandon. It weakens other unions while building on their support. With even a minimum of intelligence in the other unions such a parasitic union would be repudiated. Such has been the fate of the Municipal Employees' Association. As long as its membership was small the consequences of its policy were not observed, and its demands received the uncritical assent of others in the general approval of all efforts to raise wages. But with its rapid growth during the past two years, the unions of unskilled workmen, who suffered first from its competition for members, brought their protest to the Trades Union Congress in 1906, and that body, after careful deliberation, repudiated the Municipal Employees' Association and all similar organizations of public employees by the practically unanimous vote of 1,196,000 to 42,000. It is thus promptly settled, before this organization had reached 15,000 members throughout Great Britain, that the trade union world is clearly opposed, both in sentiment and self-interest, to the creation of a privileged class of municipal employees. As far as the regular trade unions are concerned the principle of trade-union wages, rising and falling in municipal employment the same as in private

employment, is accepted in its full significance. Without the support of the regular unions the strength of the Municipal Employees' Association has disappeared. It was a temporary phase of the rapid increase of municipal ownership.[32]

Our investigations have shown that the proper method of dealing with employees is the most difficult and critical problem of municipal ownership. The appointment, promotion and dismissal of employees and the wages to be paid offer peculiar opportunities for political and personal influence inconsistent with efficiency. Civil service reform, so-called, has been found in its highest perfection in the city of Chicago, but it is evident by comparison with a less perfect device in Syracuse that its integrity depends on the political influences that control the mayor and the heads of departments. If the head of the department is independent of politics, as shown in Cleveland, Detroit and South Norwalk, the civil service commission is not needed.[33] The Chicago system is a temporary bulwark built around the departments until such time as the chief officer himself can also be protected from political selection. This is the case in British cities where the idea of a civil service commission is unknown.[34] But even there, especially in the Sheffield tramways, appointments have been made on the recommendation of councillors. The experience of Glasgow is instructive. Fifteen years ago the practice of hiring employees on the recommendation of councillors was universal in all departments. But with the growth of municipal ownership it has almost disappeared.[35] This is partly because several thorough investigations of alleged favoritism have been made by the council; partly because public spirited business men have exposed the evil, have made it clear to the voters and have been elected to the council on the issue of driving out favoritism; and partly because the adoption of the minimum wage policy of the labor members has stopped the practice of councillors' unloading and pensioning their old employees on the municipal pay-roll.[36] The only remnant of the practice discovered after a thorough investigation in Glasgow was in the unskilled work of the tramways, and this came about through the effort of that department during the industrial depression of 1905-6 to aid the city government in finding work for the unemployed. The pressure for employment during the depression was enormous and all managers were besieged by hundreds of applicants. A card of introduction from a councillor secures at least the privilege of filling out an application blank, and this amounts to a limited preference over those who do not have such cards, but the managers follow up the application by a thorough examination before making appointments. In other places all charges of favoritism were carefully investigated and they were found to be baseless, except in the case of motormen and conductors at Sheffield. These are selected on the recommendation of councillors. The Manchester Tramway Committee, at the beginning of its organization, recognizing the possible evil, adopted a rule instructing their manager not only not to pay attention to letters from councillors but to give preference to applicants who have no such recommendations.

Our investigations have shown that the strongest safeguard for a manager against the pressure of outside recommendations is the recognition of organized labor within his department.[37] Wherever we have found a class of employees organized and dealt with as such through their representatives we have found those positions exempt from politics. This follows from the nature of labor organization which cannot survive if individuals are given preference on political, religious, personal or any other grounds than the character of the work they do. Even in the politically honeycombed municipal undertaking of Allegheny, the union of electrical workers stopped the practice of paying assessments by its members for political campaigns. The success of the civil service system of Chicago is owing more than anything else to the fact that organized labor has one of the three members on each examining board. The manager of the Manchester Tramways ascribes his freedom from interference by individual councillors to his recognition of the union that holds 90 per cent. of his motormen and conductors.[38]

PRIVATE COMPANIES AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS.

The foregoing is a review of several interests which have been discovered as tending to weaken the efficiency and integrity of municipalities in the operation or regulation of monopolies, together with the factors that tend to correct these evil tendencies. In inquiring into the part played by all of them,[39] including saloonkeepers, real estate speculators, party politicians, and municipal employees, the most impressive fact in Great Britain is the absence of any political "machine" which could bring them together and line them up under a centralized control. Whatever corrupting or incapacitating tendencies there may be in these several interests that come into conflict with good administration, each works by itself and there is no permanent interest or class of manipulators which thrives by marshaling them together in a perpetual onslaught and undermining of the city government. Public spirited and independent citizens are not compelled to enter into bargains nor to make promises to a political organization, which would disgust them with a position on the Town Council. This absence of a powerful machine is mainly due to the fact that there are no great financial bargains at stake, such as municipal contracts or franchises, whose owners have a direct interest in breaking down city government. None of the menacing factors above mentioned is large enough, and all of them combined cannot gain enough, to warrant them in making large contributions to an expensive organization for the control of elections and appointments. The brewery interest is practically the only interest of financial importance whose profits can be menaced by acts of the Council, but the menace to it is based on moral and not financial grounds. In resisting this menace it does not directly attack the business integrity of the Council, but, more important, there is no opportunity for it to make an alliance with contractors and franchise speculators who could increase their profits and make sharper bargains

with the city if the councillors were weak or corrupt, or under the control of a machine which they must support. The absence of powerful financial opponents of good government leaves the way open for business men to enter the councils and to attack abuses or defend the interests of the city without risking their private business or antagonizing their social circle. The eminent bankers, financiers, and merchants who serve the cities as aldermen on the finance committees are free to do so because neither they nor their clients or business associates are interested in stocks which might be depreciated if they helped the city to drive a good bargain. These men are often the directors in large manufacturing, railway and other private companies. Councillors and aldermen on the gas, water, electricity and tramways committees are even stockholders and directors in private gas and water companies of other towns. It would be impossible for such men to act conscientiously on the great board of municipal directors, and to give the town the same kind of service as they give to their private companies, if they or their business associates were interested in companies which had business relations with the Council. Neither could the medium and smaller business men and employers afford to accept positions on the councils and take the independent stand they do, if the bankers and large business men on whom they depend for credits and sales were interested in the stocks of franchise companies.[40] With these great antagonistic interests out of the way, the business men of the town find, not only that their private business is not menaced, but that the conditions of all private business are greatly improved, if they lend their abilities to the improvement of municipal business. The time which they take from their private affairs is often not even a business sacrifice. The honor and distinction of public service on the council is really an advertising asset in their private business. It would be a liability if they were called upon to antagonize large financial interests.

I do not hold that the contrast in American cities gives evidence that the private corporations which we have investigated have taken the initiative in corrupting and weakening the municipal councils. The initiative has just as often come from corrupt officials who "hold up" the corporations. The real question is not, Who is to blame? or, Is it blackmail or is it bribery? but the real question is, What is the situation that compels officials, campaign committees and corporations to resort to blackmail and bribery? Plainly by comparison of American and British cities the answer is found in the enormous profits at stake on municipal elections.[41]

It is the absence of a political machine and its financial contributions that also makes possible the election in British cities of remarkable groups of Labor councillors. With but few exceptions the labor members are representative of the best elements of the trade unions. Although they lack the financial experience of business men they contribute a valuable knowledge of labor conditions on which successful management of municipal undertakings depends. Men of their integrity and earnestness have the opportunity

to come forward because the trade unions are not undermined nor their leaders bribed by the paid agents of a political machine.[42] And the financial interests that would profit by the election of weak or dishonest labor candidates are not powerful enough to subsidize the astute agents needed by the machine for the purpose.

A contrast with this situation appears in two of the places visited where private companies operate public utilities. The municipal council of Newcastle-on-Tyne is decidedly inferior in quality and ability to others,[43] and two of the leading financiers on the council declared that their only reason for remaining in the position is the election which the council gives them as corporation representatives on the Tyne Improvement Commission. The presence of private gas, electricity and water companies, with their representatives in the council, prevents the leading business men from interesting themselves in the success of the municipal government, while an equivocal class of labor agitators takes advantage of the situation to get elected to the council. Sheffield, also, with its influential gas company, is the only town visited where the employees in the tramway and street departments are appointed through the influence of councillors. In that town there is a peculiar inducement for the eminent business men in charge of the gas company to look with approval on the election of inferior councillors, because the council elects three of its members as directors of the company. The strength of the company is seen in the incompetency of these municipal directors, who are kept in ignorance of essential details in its affairs. With councillors of this inferior type and with the indifference of business men to the management of municipal affairs, the result is seen in the absence of any protest against practices which are undermining the municipal undertakings.

Certain effects of the municipal ownership movement in Great Britain on the private companies are evident. The Sheffield Company, under the far-seeing management of Sir Frederick Mappin, has directed its policy for many years with the distinct purpose of meeting the arguments for municipal ownership. To avoid agitation it has refrained from going to Parliament for permission to increase its capital stock. Consequently it has distributed its large surplus profit in the form of reduced prices for gas and betterments to its plant. Most instructive of all is the attitude of the companies toward their employees. With the sentiment of municipal ownership ready to explode,[44] the companies cannot afford to risk a strike. The Newcastle gas company has met this situation by a willing recognition of the gas workers' union and by a resort to arbitration through which wages have been materially raised. The South Metropolitan Company has developed its copartnership scheme with astonishing shrewdness and careful attention to details, so that every disaffected workman is silent or dismissed. The Sheffield Company, although its president had openly attacked and wrecked trade unions in his private business, contented itself with gradually undermining the gas workers' union, through the payment of wages and bonuses superior to those paid by other private employers of the

district, and even in the case of unskilled labor, superior to those paid by the corporation of Sheffield.

TRADE UNIONS AND WAGES.

The influence of wage-earners through their unions upon the conditions of municipal employment in the United States has been complicated through the presence and activity of practical politicians. In the municipal enterprises investigated, except South Norwalk and Richmond, the eight-hour day has been established for the past ten or fifteen years for all employees, whereas in the private companies the hours are longer or have more recently been reduced for a portion, but not all, of their employees in the more skilled branches of work. This advantage in municipal undertakings has been brought about, not by a definite labor party, but by the influence of wage-earners as voters upon the municipal officials.[45]

A curious contrast, however, presents itself in the wages paid by contractors on municipal work. While the larger cities in their own employment reduced the hours several years before similar reductions were made by British municipalities, yet, unlike the British municipalities, provision was not made requiring contractors on municipal works to observe the hours and wages paid by the municipalities themselves. It has only been within the past five or six years that a definite movement was undertaken by the wage-earning element to extend these provisions to contractors, and this, on account of adverse decisions of the courts, led to the adoption in New York of a constitutional amendment in 1905 stipulating that the prevailing rate of wages should be paid by contractors on the work of the State or its sub-divisions. This clause has recently been adopted by the city of Chicago. The hand of the politician is seen in the omission of the contractors from the requirement respecting wages and hours, since by this device he was able to win both the wage-earners and the contractors to his support. But with the more extensive organization of wage-earners and their independence of the politicians, the contractors are placed on the same basis as the municipality.

In only one case investigated in the United States is there a formal trade agreement between the union and a municipal department,[46] namely, that of the electricity department of Chicago, but since permanent appointments in that and other departments of Chicago are controlled by the Civil Service Commission, the effect of this agreement is to control only the temporary or sixty-day appointments. The unions, however, are recognized by the Civil Service Commission to the extent that an officer of the union concerned is appointed as one of the three members of the examining board which passes upon applicants for municipal positions. The other two members are employers or technical experts selected by the commission outside the municipal service. The consequence of this arrangement is that the unions are satisfied that the Civil Service law is honestly administered, and at the same time the non-union workmen are protected against discrimination. In Great

Britain there are two undertakings, Birmingham gas and Manchester tramways, which have trade agreements with the unions, and in all other places the same result is reached by the provision requiring the payment of trade-union rates of wages.[47]

The municipal undertakings in both countries are necessarily "open shop," in the sense that employment is open both to union and non-union men. In the case of the more skilled trades this usually results in the employment of union men, depending partly on the attitude of the manager.[48] This attitude is favorable to the unions in all of the British municipalities except Liverpool and is favorable in the American cities of Cleveland, Detroit and Chicago. In these places the managers consult the union officers in arranging wages, hours, and conditions of work. The three American places mentioned are those where the political machine, supported by the contractors and franchise corporations, has been eliminated from the control of the city government by a popular revolt against the corporations. But in Allegheny, Syracuse, Wheeling and Indianapolis,[49] where a combination of politicians and franchise corporations is in control of the municipal government, the attitude is distinctly hostile to the unions, and appointments and promotions are made with reference to the political adherence of the employees. The exception to this statement is found in the Allegheny electric undertaking to the extent that the Electrical Workers' Union has organized the linemen. In this case appointments are not made on political grounds and the linemen do not pay the assessments required of other employees. Of the private companies investigated in Great Britain, all of them except one were hostile to union labor. The exception is the Newcastle gas, which has had open-shop agreements with a gas workers' union during seventeen years. In the United States all of the private companies are hostile to union labor.[50] Most of the companies in both countries protested that they were not hostile, while only one asserted positively that it was, but the acts and policies of all, as shown by our investigations, demonstrate their hostility. The situation respecting each branch of organized labor in both classes of undertakings is briefly as follows:

The Electrical Workers' Union throughout the United States numbers about 21,000 members. Its principal strength is found among the wiremen, who are associated with other skilled trades in the construction of buildings, among shop men in manufacturing establishments, and among linemen employed by telephone companies. The organization has a much smaller proportion of the employees of electric light and street railway companies. It has no organization among private companies coming under our investigation. It has an organization in the Detroit Electric Company, which we used for comparison with the Detroit municipal undertaking. The presence of the municipal enterprise, with its eight-hour day and its recognition of the Electrical Workers' Union during the past eight years, has served as a standard by which this private company has endeavored to guide itself and to put itself in as favorable position before the public as the municipal undertaking. The

company indeed has created a semi-pension position for the president of the Electrical Workers' local union, giving him leave of absence to use his influence among aldermen and the working people of the town at times when the council has before it an ordinance for the regulation or reduction of rates or services. The situation is different in Chicago, where a local union of the same organization has been defeated in strikes by the electricity companies and where the union is able to maintain its scale of wages and secure employment with those companies only in the branches of work connected with the building trades where it has the support of other trade unions in the town. Even in that exceptional circumstance, the union has been compelled to allow its men to work at 15 cents a day less than the scale paid by the municipality and by other fair employers. The organization is not represented in the municipal enterprise of South Norwalk, although the local union has officially declared that undertaking to be a "fair shop" and permits its members to work alongside municipal employees who are not members.

The situation of the Electrical Workers' Union in Great Britain is somewhat similar to that of the corresponding organization in this country. It, however, has been handicapped by the fact that the powerful association of Amalgamated Engineers (machinists) has always claimed electrical workers as coming under its jurisdiction. Four other unions also claim jurisdiction over the electrical workers. The Amalgamated Engineers are interested more in the organization of fitters, turners and blacksmiths than in the organization of electrical workers, pattern makers and other smaller elements claimed by them. It has only been in the past year that the Amalgamated Engineers recognized the Electrical Trade Union and consented to their admission on equal terms in the Engineering and Shipbuilding Federation. One consequence of the conflict with other unions is that the Electrical Workers' Union[51] in that country has not been aggressive and has limited itself practically to municipal employees and the employees of contractors on municipal work. It has only recently begun organizing the shop men in manufacturing establishments, but has no men with any of the private companies investigated.

The stationary firemen's organization includes about 13,000 members throughout the United States,[52] of whom 4,000 are in New York City. This organization is not strongly represented in any of the places investigated except Chicago and Cleveland, where it includes all of the firemen in the municipal electric and water works. The union was defeated in a strike by the Commonwealth and Edison companies of Chicago and has no representation now in their employment. It has members in the municipal undertaking of Detroit, but not in Syracuse, Richmond or Wheeling, nor in any of the private undertakings. This union claims jurisdiction over stokers in gas works, but none of its members were found either in the municipal or the private gas undertakings.

The national union of stationary engineers,[53] with its 17,500 members, has members in the municipal undertakings of Cleveland,

Detroit, Allegheny, Wheeling, and Chicago, but not in Richmond nor in any of the private undertakings.

The firemen and engineers of Great Britain are claimed by a half dozen organizations, all of them weak and conflicting and none of them represented in any of the establishments visited. Where the gas workers' union is recognized it includes the firemen.

There is one organization, that of street railway employees, for which comparisons between private and public employment cannot be made in the United States, since there are no municipal undertakings of that character. The British organization, which nominally includes teamsters and drivers as well as motormen and conductors, is practically confined to the latter, and for the last six years has increased its membership solely among motormen and conductors. Its membership consists of 9,500 in municipal employment and 1,500 in private employment,[54] a ratio of one-half of the motormen and conductors employed by all municipalities and one-third of those employed by all companies. The three private companies investigated, namely London, Norwich and Dublin, have taken a decided stand against the organization, have discharged those of its employees who became members and have required bonds or deposits which are forfeited if the men quit without giving one or two weeks' notice. Two of the municipalities, London and Manchester, are organized in this association to the extent of nine-tenths of their employees, while in two other establishments investigated, Liverpool and Glasgow, the municipalities have established benefit associations, and in Liverpool the union was disrupted by embezzlement on the part of its officers. The wages are so much in advance of what these employees received from the former private companies that the union does not appear to offer them any particular advantages if they should join it. In the United States, where the street railway employees are all in the service of private companies, the membership of the union paying dues throughout the country was 36,000 in 1902 out of a total number of employees eligible to membership in that year of 134,000.[55] This was 27 per cent. of the employees of those companies, or something less than the proportion organized in the private companies of Great Britain and about half of the proportion which the British union has of the municipal employees.

In none of the American enterprises investigated were the common laborers organized. In the municipal undertakings they are paid higher wages and given shorter hours than in the case of private employees of the same locality. They are also in all cases citizens of the United States, and residents of the locality. The common labor of the private companies, except in Indianapolis and the Southern cities, where they are colored, is composed largely of immigrants and no attention is paid as to whether they have secured citizenship papers or not.

MINIMUM WAGES.

In the matter of wages and hours the principal effect of municipal ownership is seen in the unskilled and unorganized labor in both

countries, in that of street railway employees in Great Britain and in that of gas workers and electric workers in the United States.

The policy of all of the British municipalities is to place the minimum wages of common labor at the level paid by the best private employers for similar work.[56] This is about 15 per cent. to 40 per cent. higher than other private wages for the same class of labor in the same locality. The greatest difference, that of Leicester, was the result of arbitration, brought about through the organization of common labor in that town. In this case those private employers who recognized the union paid the same wages as the municipality. In one locality, Sheffield, the minimum wage paid by the gas company is higher than the minimum paid by the municipality and other private employers, and the gas company at Newcastle pays its organized common labor the same minimum as the municipality, but all of the electric and tramway companies pay less for common labor doing the same kind of work than the municipalities in which they are located.[57]

In the United States the minimum paid for common labor by the private companies is, in all cases, except Atlanta, lower than that of the municipality, and the minimum paid for common labor by municipal undertakings is higher than that of private companies of the same locality.[58] The correspondence runs as follows: Syracuse, municipal $1.50 for eight hours, private $1.50 for ten hours; Detroit, municipal $1.75 for eight hours, private $1.80 for nine hours; Allegheny, municipal $2.75 for eight hours, private $1.75 for ten hours; Wheeling, municipal $1.85 for eight and nine hours, private $1.85 for ten hours; Cleveland, municipal $1.76 for eight hours, private $1.75 for ten hours; Indianapolis, municipal $1.60 for eight hours, private $1.50 for ten hours; Chicago, municipal $2.00 for eight hours, private $1.75 for ten hours; New Haven, municipal $1.50 for eight hours, private $1.50 for nine hours; Richmond, municipal $2.00 for nine hours, private $1.20 for nine hours; Atlanta, municipal and private $1.00 for ten hours.

These are the minimum rates and not the average rates nor the highest rates paid for unskilled and usually unorganized labor.[59] In this respect the municipalities, both in Great Britain and the United States, have adopted the trade-union principle of the minimum wage for that class of labor which ordinarily has no union, and all of the familiar arguments for and against the theory of the minimum wage as applied to trade unions can be brought forward as applied to the municipalities. Against the minimum wage theory is the criticism that it shuts out from employment the old men who are not worth the minimum wage, and my colleague, though speaking ostensibly for the trade unions, nevertheless by condemning this result in municipal employment, condemns the fundamental principle of trade-unionism. The private companies investigated, which pay less than the minimum, of course, justify it on the ground that the Italians, negroes, and others employed are not worth the minimum, but the trade unionist usually tells them that by paying the minimum they would attract better workmen. So far as our in-

vestigations have gone, they show that in municipal employment this has been the case. Since the adoption of the minimum wage policy,[60] enforced sometimes by civil service rules, the quality, character, physique, and efficiency of the common labor employed by municipalities has been greatly improved, and municipal employment has ceased to be looked upon as an old-age pension for laborers worn out in private employment. This is a hardship to individuals to the same extent that trade-unionism is a hardship to individuals. But from the standpoint of the municipality it is a gain, because more competent laborers are employed, and municipal employment is clearly distinguished from municipal charity. The aged and inefficient laborers, discharged from private employment, and unable to secure municipal employment, must, of course, be supported from the public treasury, and it is a significant fact that the movement for old-age pensions as a substitute for the poorhouse in Great Britain has been strengthened by the minimum wage policy of the past ten years which has relieved municipal employment of its poorhouse features.

In all of the occupations where organized labor was found, the policy of all of the municipalities investigated, except South Norwalk, is that of paying the trade-union rate. This is also, of course, a minimum rate and the conditions are the same as those governing private employers of the locality who recognize the union. A few cases of individuals were found where the city was paying individuals less than the unions, but these were cases in which the union had granted a permit to work below the scale on account of old age, or were cases over which a dispute as to the character of the work was in process of adjustment, or where, as in Chicago, wages in private employment had been advanced after the municipal budget had been voted and the latter could not under the law be changed until the next fiscal year. We have not found any instance, except that of the Municipal Employees' Association in Great Britain, above mentioned, where the unions have demanded higher minimum wages of the municipality than those paid by union employers. Individuals, both in municipal and private undertakings, get higher wages than the union minimum.

Outside the ranks of unskilled labor in Great Britain the principal difference between wages in municipal and private undertakings is found in the case of the motormen and conductors on tramways. This has been brought about by a reduction in the hours of labor in municipal employment, so that in two municipal undertakings, Glasgow and Manchester, the hours have been reduced to 54 per week, and in two others, the Liverpool and London County Council, to 60 per week, while in the three private undertakings the hours are 70 per week.[61] Since the wages have not been decreased the result is seen in the rate of pay per hour. Taking the London County Council Tramways and the London United Tramways, where comparisons can fairly be made, since both are in the same town, the wages for motormen are 4.2 per cent. and for conductors 30 per cent. higher on the municipal than on the private system.

Outside London, considering the local levels of wages, the municipal undertakings pay higher wages than the private undertakings. This difference is not owing to the change from horse to electrical traction, since the wages on the municipal undertakings were advanced when the municipality secured possession, which in the case of Glasgow was six years before electrical traction was adopted. The private companies, although paying less than the municipalities, have also advanced their rates of pay with the introduction of electrical traction. The same is true of the traction companies in the United States, although our investigations have not included a survey of these companies, and we are unable to make[62] a statistical comparison.*

In the case of gas workers employed by the municipalities and private companies in Great Britain it has been found that, with the exception of the South Metropolitan Company, there is not much difference between the wages paid in the two classes of undertakings. The differences observed in this occupation grow out of the amount of work required of the stokers. On account of the severity of the work it is the practice both of the private companies and the munici-

*The practice of my colleague in going outside the matters actually investigated by us and introducing criticisms that we have not investigated may be judged by his quotation from a socialist critic of the Glasgow tramways—a class of critics whom in general he loses no opportunity to discredit. Since these criticisms have been introduced after our report was handed in, I have had no opportunity of "running them down," as was thoroughly done in other cases, and can only quote from a reply to my inquiries received from the General Manager under date of May 20, 1907. He says: "In regard to the first point, we never ask an applicant for a situation for a written 'character'; we simply wish to know from him what situations he has been in during the past five years, and the names of his employers during that period. On leaving the service he is informed that any communications regarding him will be promptly attended to."

"The question of conductors paying the full value for lost tickets is fully dealt with in the report sent you." The report referred to is one made under date of February 20, 1907, by the General Manager to the Tramways Committee, in answering a petition of the Municipal Employees' Association, and includes the following paragraph: "The conductors desire that when any of the tickets entrusted to them go astray, they should only be held responsible for the cost of printing the lost tickets and not for their face value. I cannot find that any conductor during the past year has been charged the face value of lost tickets who has come forward with an explanation. We must, however, be very strict in the matter of lost tickets because these tickets are worth their face value both to the department and to the conductors. They must therefore be regarded practically as cash. Each case is considered on its merits, and I am perfectly satisfied that the conductors have nothing to complain of in the way they are treated in regard to lost tickets."

The General Manager continues: "I never heard it suggested that in our service men are supposed to report each other for neglect of duty."

"In regard to the wearing of uniform, we would not allow a man to take up duty unless he were properly dressed."

"The punching of a ticket in the wrong place is a very serious offence."

Respecting the statement that 1,085 men on the Glasgow tramways "have less than three years' standing as employees," the essential fact is omitted that nearly one-half of these are filling new positions created during the past three years by extension of the system.

pal undertakings in the United States to require the stokers to work actually only one-half of the number of hours for which they are paid, the other half being available for recreation. This is true also in three of the municipal undertakings in Great Britain, while in the fourth, Glasgow, the stokers work five hours out of the eight instead of four. In this respect Glasgow is on the same basis with the most favorable of the private companies, Newcastle, where on account of the presence of a strong labor organization, the stokers also are on the basis of five hours' work for eight hours' pay. In the other two private companies, which have succeeded in destroying the labor organizations[63] that formerly existed, the amount of work required of the men has been increased to a greater degree than the increase of wages. So severe was this hardship on the employees of the South Metropolitan Company that in two of the stations they voted to accept the proposition of the company to return to the twelve-hour day and to forego the advantages of the eight-hour day, which they had secured through their union in 1889. By increasing slightly the total amount of work in the twelve-hour shift they increased their total daily wages, but the cost of labor to the company is the same on the twelve-hour basis as it is in the other stations on the eight-hour basis. Measuring their wages, however, by the hour, the men on the twelve-hour basis receive the lowest rates of pay of all the private and municipal undertakings. This twelve-hour system, resulting from the smashing of the union and the overwork of the employees, is approved in some quarters as a "genuine example of co-operation."

At the other extreme the least amount of work required of stokers is in the municipal undertaking at Manchester, and there the reduction in the amount of work has been criticised as indicating a detrimental influence of trade unions upon the municipal undertaking. A question of this kind must be decided according to the opinions of the investigators. Looking at the severity of the work it would be unwarranted to say that the stokers in the Manchester municipal undertaking are doing a smaller amount of work than should be fairly required of them. An important consequence of the policy of the Manchester municipality in its effort to avoid overworking the stokers is seen in its effort to greatly improve the equipment of the plant in order to reduce the amount of labor required, the net result being that the labor cost in Manchester is not greater than in other places.

In the United States the gas workers are on the twelve-hour day at Richmond and Atlanta, but in the municipal plant at Wheeling all employees have the eight-hour day, while with the private company at Philadelphia the shift men in the retort house were placed on the eight-hour day when the company took possession. They had worked twelve hours under municipal ownership. The wages paid by the Richmond municipal plant, all of whose employees are whites, are 90 per cent. to 100 per cent. higher than the wages paid to negroes who do similar work in the Atlanta private undertaking, and the wages paid to white mechanics and apprentices at Richmond are 30 per cent. to 120 per cent. higher than those paid to the corresponding white employees by the Atlanta

company.[64] In one occupation, that of the bricklayer, the wages in the two places are the same.

In the electric industries in Great Britain, outside of employment of unskilled labor, there does not appear to be any material difference in the rates paid by the municipalities and the private companies taken as a whole. It was not possible to make an exact comparison on account of the differences in classification and the wide range of wages, depending partly upon the size of the undertaking.[65] Such differences as were found to exist between municipal and private undertakings might be explained upon the basis of the differences in the level of wages in the several localities.

In the United States in all cases, except South Norwalk and Detroit, the wages paid by the municipal electric undertakings are materially higher than those paid by the private undertakings of the same localities. The widest difference is found in Allegheny and in Chicago. The only positions in which the private electrical companies of Chicago pay as high wages for similar work as the municipal undertaking is that of a small number of their wiremen, who work alongside the other organized building trades of the city.[66] Their other wiremen doing the same work get less pay.

In the matter of "welfare work," or provision for the comfort, cleanliness and recreation of employees, the best conditions were found in the works of the Commonwealth Electric Company at Chicago,[67] the municipal water works at Cleveland, the Philadelphia gas works, the municipal gas at Leicester, municipal trams at Glasgow and Liverpool and South Metropolitan gas at London. The worst conditions were at Wheeling and Richmond municipal gas and Sheffield private gas. In general, the buildings and works constructed during the past four or five years, both in private and municipal undertakings, show a great improvement over the older buildings and works, in the provision for baths, lavatories, lunch and cooking rooms, recreation rooms and grounds. Taking the entire list of properties visited, the best under one form of ownership is equalled by the best under the other form, and so on down to the worst. The superior character of the municipal undertakings over private undertakings in Great Britain is partly owing to their more recent construction, and the converse is true in the United States.

In Great Britain,[68] but not in the United States, were found systems of insurance, thrift funds, sick, death and accident benefits, both in municipal and private undertakings. The most extensive and elaborate of these is that of the South Metropolitan Company, connected with its system of profit sharing and compulsory investment of profits in the company's stocks. This system is ingeniously contrived to destroy the gas workers' union by subjecting its employees to the conspiracy laws,[69] and to enable the company to "contract out" from the Workmen's Compensation laws. The municipal gas works of Glasgow has copied the system so far as it relates to profit sharing and conspiracy, but not to workmen's compensation. All other municipal and private establishments pay accident benefits as required by this national legislation.

ANALYSIS

OF INVESTIGATOR COMMONS' "LABOR AND POLITICS."

By J. W. SULLIVAN.

See reference numbers in the review referred to, page 88.

1. The "sentences" "picked out" here referred to (quoted in the begining of my review, page 60), are paragraphs indited by Investigator Commons, after I had demonstrated to him their truth. Summaries of a series of inquiries, they conceded that in Great Britain municipalization had not improved wages and conditions in general for employees in the skilled occupations organized as trade unions, but had slightly done so for the unskilled workers of a grade higher than the average in the labor market, aided by the political pressure coming from the Municipal Employees' Association and kindred political organizations and the social bodies demanding the "living wage." By this "picking out" of passages I gave a satisfactory reply to one of the first questions repeatedly asked me in America among workingmen: "Have municipalized gas works, street railways, etc., really done so much in England for the hands as is talked about in America by municipal ownership advocates?" If my colleague, in the comprehensive statements of these paragraphs, gave away a large part of his case, diminishing thenceforth the interest of American wage-earners in his municipal cornucopia, he should have foreseen the result. And if he himself proceeded to show that "municipal employees sooner or later cast their votes for candidates who promise or who have secured a betterment of their conditions" (page 97), he merely fortified my argument that so-called trade unions of municipal employees are mainly political, and hence repugnant to the established economic and non-political principles of unionism. These sweeping admissions by Investigator Commons given at the outset, I disposed of what to many inquirers is a good part of the municipal ownership question. It was indeed impossible for him to pick out from our joint report any passages equally damaging to private operation. Municipal ownership, after fair trial, had, as its most striking outcome in regard to labor, substituted a narrow field of employment in a bureaucracy where changes in conditions were mostly subject to political methods, for the broad field in free industry open to all grades of labor, where conditions might be improved for all alike through the collective self-help of trade unionism and the individual self-help of personal efficiency.

2. A claim that withers under examination. To write that sentence while totally ignoring the lessons he learned at the Philadelphia gas works, to cite but one example, required effrontery.

3. The principle prevalent in the wonderful development of the United States has been that it is essential to the rate of progress to have work done even with waste. The ruling idea in Great Britain has been official supervision to the point of suppression in order to protect vested rights or, in the case of cities, to hold back "public utility" developments for municipal operation. The combined results of municipal ownership and governmental interference in Great Britain with the tramway and electrical industries

have rendered the kingdom one of the most backward countries in those regards in the world. In both industries it is far behind Italy. If the ratio of the supply in the United Kingdom were equal to that in the United States, a competent observer made out two years ago that there would be 1,256 places supplied with electric lighting instead of its 457; 14,000 miles of electric railway instead of its 3,040, and 50,000 persons employed in the telephone industry instead of its 13,000.

4. Until within a few years American municipalities, unheedful of the exact cost, were inviting capital to come and take franchises and help develop. And before and since, the energies of the people, press, and prosecution have been expended in exposing the blunders of the inefficient, and the jobbery, sinecurism, and maladministration of the rascally, officeholders.

5. "The purest of indefinite nonsense," was the comment on this passage by a gas company President who last year travelled in Great Britain to observe for himself.

6. Not correct. The American companies were not asked for this permission. The only American management that refused access to our engineers and accountants was that of the Richmond municipal gas. Already, by the law, in Great Britain, public service companies furnish to the government Board of Trade such statistics. In the United States similar information given to private investigation might be used in the stock market.

7. A complicated question. Municipal ownership agitators and political "sandbaggers" have held this threat over the British companies. On the other hand, municipalities have had strikes.

8. None of the anti-municipal members of our Commission opposed a system of uniform public accounting. The British companies, like the municipalities, must make returns to the government. This has nothing to do in heading off strikes.

9. One set of vices may in cases have to an extent been avoided. But such vices play no essential part in private operation, since in many other cases they have been eliminated, or had, because of just municipal control, never developed. But municipal ownership has invariably engendered its own peculiar and ineffaceable vices, dangerous to society in proportion to the number of employees.

Investigator Commons' opening paragraph is a model of random inaccuracies and misty conclusions.

10. It would have been well for his cause had he been able to exalt municipal ownership as much after this investigaton as was his habit before I went with him to witness its marvels and we were shown its shams.

11. For each municipality to have "full power and home rule" to change from private to public ownership in gas, transit, water, and electricity would in many cases be but a violation of home rule. The water supply of a dozen municipalities in Union, Hudson and Essex Counties in New Jersey is in a single system. So to an extent are the gas, trolley, and electricity supplies in these and other counties. To permit a single municipality to secede at will from such a system once formed would be to set at naught a contract with the other municipalities and open the way for local political machines to blackmail the trunk undertakings already giving the supplies. Again, London's boroughs have learned a sad

lesson in so-called home rule in electricity. A single central electric system for the Metropolitan district could cut the price by a good percentage, but what would then become of the borough systems? By true home rule all the people directly concerned, and not a fraction of them, settle their common public questions under principles established by the State. The English Socialists have abandoned municipal home rule for tramways, water, and electricity, and now call for "municipalization by provinces."

12. Aye; government is simply a question of politics, whether in Russia or Switzerland. In this paragraph Investigator Commons confuses unlike ideas in one term, a mental defect of which he is often the victim. But in the last clause—"we only get a different kind of politics"—he nearly sees through his fog. Municipal ownership gives us politics perpetual, in every aspect, at each step, from the initiation of a service to its separate extensions and down to the last point in the details of its administration—a long chain of politics, no stronger than its weakest link. Through operation by contract, a well governed municipality may have politics focussed on one transaction and thenceforth attenuated to the vanishing point. The communities so feeble in public virtue that they cannot protect themselves by stipulating a fair franchise and an honest supervision of service would under municipal operation stand little chance of "getting and keeping the right kind of men to manage and operate the municipal undertakings."

13. Competition regulates all honestly awarded contract work for municipalities, even in the common so-called monopolistic supplies requiring forms of exclusive possession of the streets.

14. Not correct. This entire passage is disproven by the denial from these associations that any such "indorsement" was ever made. See page 9.

15. With my review in his hands ten weeks before the Twenty-One met, June 10, 1907, my colleague had had abundant time for conciliatory representations when he so reluctantly penned this painful explanation. Needless and untruthful, it betrays his judgment overcome by resentment at reading my digest of our evidence against municipal ownership. "When unable to answer, abuse your opponent!"

16. Not correct. This astonishing falsehood is fully exposed pages 3 to 8.

17. After he reads the numerous corrections in the essentials of his testimony I have put on record against him in these pages, and sees how many qualified men have come forward to disprove his assertions, he will have reason to see the futility of parading his positiveness and rectitude.

18. This paragraph takes a place in the same category as his description of the Sheffield and Newcastle Town Councils. In neither case did his allegations relate to a matter of prescribed investigation by our Commission. He was careful to carry on this "thoroughness of investigation" without my knowledge and contrary to instructions.

19. Then to persist in not seeing that the cleansing of our municipal politics first is indispensable to any success in municipal operation is wilful blindness. He was not commissioned to go forth seeking all the remote facts that in his judgment or at his needs

would help his argument, but he was working under instructions to investigate certain undertakings with me.

20. "It was found." By whom? By himself, from unnamed sources at Syracuse and Allegheny. As to Chicago and Philadelphia, see statements on the point, Part II, Vol. I, pages 142 and 520, and note the flimsy bases for these serious charges.

21. In this paragraph, whether right or not as to political appointments in the two forms of undertakings, he admits the underlying causes of dry rot in the trade unions composed wholly or in part of municipal employees. It is a paragraph to be studied by trade unionists.

22. The civil service of Mayor Dunne's administration does not stand so high in public estimation in 1908 as it did in municipal ownership circles in 1906.

23. "Are found." By whom? Where is the evidence? In this paragraph and the one ensuing he is sole witness and self-appointed judge. Under the rules laid down by the Commission his proceeding was irregular. His assertion as to the "accident" of his personal acquaintance is a bit of playfulness, meant for the credulous. The last seven lines of the second paragraph were slipped in after his review had been sent to the Committee of Twenty-One.

24. "Definite information was obtained." By whom? From whom? What can be done to hold a supposedly scientific observer down to well-authenticated fact when he indulges in a series of loose allegations such as these?

25. Not correct. I attended, while on my tours for this Commission, meetings of four Councils—those of Richmond, Chicago, Glasgow, and London—and made on the spot inquiries as to the standing of the men who took the floor. I do not know that my colleague attended any such meetings. Surface indications did not rate the two American Councils low. The members of the Richmond Council were in appearance of a fine type of Southern citizenship, orderly in debate and business-like in dispatching their work. There was no symptom of partisanship, buncombe, or "reform" hoodwinking. The Chicago Council's striking features were democratic informality, directness and speediness, with a good-humored snuffing out of political play. The Glasgow Council's session was enlivened, as I have said, by charges and counter-charges from heated partisans, talk for the galleries, and tit-for-tat taunts and gibes. Notable elements, as pointed out to me, were the known defenders of the liquor interests, one or two non-working Laborites, several red-flag Socialists, many sanguine municipalists, and not a few small politician dummies. The London County Council's several sessions I attended were largely occupied with disputed questions regarding the financial outcome of acquired or projected lodging houses, tramways, steamboats, etc. The Moderates foretold their day that was coming and in parliamentary language plainly doubted the accuracy of the Progressives' reports. In the many talks over the character of Councilmen which I heard in various cities, it seemed human nature to exhibit generosity in the judgment of fellow-partisans and hardness of heart toward opponents. Of course, the true character of a Councilman can only be revealed in a series of votes that tests his integrity, intelligence, consistency and devotion to the community above self or party.

26. A statement little likely to promote immediate municipalization in America. Have the municipal ownership leaders given this admission its just weight?

27. Not correct. In Scotland, by Councils; in England, by licensing magistrates, except for places of amusement.

28. Not correct. All the Labor Party men do not call themselves Socialists.

29. Not correct. Far from it. Mr. Dalrymple, tramways, Glasgow, is the solitary well-known instance, according to the information given me by Englishmen to whom I showed this statement in April, 1908.

30. Another admission fatal in the American mind to municipalization. On considering it, workmen in private employment might consequently assume an attitude of opposition to municipal ownership.

31. The swinging from one party to another, or from one candidate to another, of one vote in twenty—50 in 1,000—would have affected the result in enough Presidential elections to completely change the history of the United States; a transfer of one vote in fourteen would at some time have altered important local policies in every subdivision of every State. But municipal and government employees always vote; they live in and on politics, and bring out their friends on election day. The twenty to forty per cent of registered voters not voting are mostly those having no personal stake in the result. One-fourteenth of the registered voters may represent one-eighth of the actual voters, and with men they influence one-sixth.

32. Not correct. For the errors in this paragraph see page 11. Evidence is not wholly lacking in the United States that certain local unions are run considerably for the benefit of their members in municipal or government employ.

33. No better arrangement precedent to any necessary form of municipal ownership, such as the water supply or markets, has come under the Commission's observation than having the head of a department wholly independent of politics, where possible; but as to whether this system is firmly established in Cleveland one will be able to form a sound judgment only after several changes of administration; in Detroit, the headship of the electricity department is difficult to locate—in the Superintendent, Secretary or Commission.

34. Sheffield tramways were not investigated. Investigator Commons once gave me this information as coming from a street car conductor with whom he had a casual chat while on his car!

35. Unsupported statements. Testimony from members of the Labor and Socialist parties, the Municipal Employees' Association, the Citizens' Union, and the heads of the municipalized departments themselves, some of which I have elsewhere given, is to the effect that Councillors continually "give lines" to workmen seeking employment. Will a municipal undertaking manager steadily ignore the recommendations given their henchmen by the Councillors who hold his own situation in their hands?

36. "Thorough investigation" of a day or two. This oft-used phrase loses its force when the reader knows that we had not the time in our investigation to go exhaustively into such points, which might well take a special commission months.

37. This is not "organized labor" in the trade union sense, but organizations of municpal employees for mutual benefit and political ends. The Secretaries inevitably are tempted to become vote bargainers with Councillors and municipal managers.

38. "Influence" in these circumstances passes from the Councillors to the organization, i. e., the Secretary, who, wielding the boycott vote club, gets work for its members, sees that they are not easily discharged, and with other secretaries advocates more municipalization.

39. Some of these interests, in powerful form, are usually with the machine in America, ready to assist it in swallowing new municipal undertakings. In London, the Socialists have a model machine; and few seats in the County Council are held independently of a party organization. In the situation in London to-day big companies fighting for their existence—a very large stake—do what they can to prevent Socialist and Progressive majorities from holding power and virtually confiscating their property, either by compulsory sale or burdensome taxation. In boroughs in the East End of London, where local taxation has reached 8 and even 12 shillings (and the Socialist cry is "Rates, twenty shillings to the pound!") manufacturing is heavily handicapped in competition with enterprises in the provinces near London where rates are but 2 shillings. London capitalists have hence been forced into forming a political machine to protect their industries, and in the recent elections their workmen have stood by them. In his remarks on the brewery interest, Thorough Investigator Commons finds himself still floundering in his ridiculous blunder of making Councils in England (the London County Council, for example) license the saloons. They have nothing to do with licensing, except places of entertainment, such as music halls, which have but an infinitesimal part of the retail beer business.

It would be difficult to cram more errors of fact and comment into an equal number of lines than has Investigator Commons in this description of what Americans call "local politics" in Great Britain. He is seeing London through Milwaukee eyes.

40. How is it, then, that wageworkers are invariably found ready to become active in trade unions, thus risking their bread and butter? One good reason for the absence of large business men from British Town Councils is that they cannot spare two to four days a week following the details of municipalized undertakings. But the small business man, leaving his wife or a clerk in charge of the shop, has the amateur's liking for running gas works and street cars, with public funds, and acting prominent citizen at public dinners or on excursions to other towns, or even to the Continent, expenses paid.

41. There are no "enormous profits" for either political party in Philadelphia in the gas works of that city to-day, nor can there be for twenty years. In the hands of an operating company, on terms satisfactory to the community, these works do not form one of the prizes in politics that they did when owned and operated by the city. Taking these works as an example, American municipalities could abolish the situation depicted by Investigator Commons, a fact he has been throughout careful to avoid recognizing.

42. Not a few of the trade unions in Great Britain are to-day undermined by the extent to which political municipalism and par-

liamentarism has been substituted for trade unionism. As was the case in San Francisco, political unionists, elbowing aside trade-union unionists, are threatening the independence of the union man's vote if he talks about supporting what party he pleases; are trying to run the labor machines that return Councillors and Members of Parliament.

43. Not correct. See page 15.

44. Not correct. There have been strikes of the stokers at the three private works here alluded to. The Sheffield company makes no concealment of its preparedness for a strike, if incited from the outside, though one would be folly considering the good wages of the men. The Newcastle company's men are at present in a very poor state of organization. The incorrectness of Investigator Commons' reference to the South Metropolitan Company is fully exposed, page 21. Sir Frederick Mappin has certainly illustrated to the world the superiority of the situation at the Sheffield gas works to any situation possible under municipal ownership. The wages rate has stood as a model in a dispute at a neighboring municipal undertaking, the price of gas is the lowest in the kingdom, and in all respects the terms with the customers and the municipality are exemplary.

45. "Reform" with "the knife."

46. Aside from the section in the building trades, where the factors of organization are special, and in the Department of Electricity, the Chicago electric workers' union is weak. The interests of the men in that occupation in the city are not integral, as they must be in a union to be successful. They can only be so when the conditions of employment in the city department are the same as in private industry.

47. For "unions" read "organizations of municipal employees." The Manchester tramway men's organization is now in large part merged in the Municipal Employees' Association, according to the latter's General Secretary.

48. In Chicago, committees of various unions wait on the Council appropriations committees, not on the water department chiefs. In Cleveland, the Central Labor Union's committees, and not a laborers' union committee, consult with the water Superintendent. In both cases, the higgling of the labor market may be affected by the propinquity of the vote market. In Detroit, a petition of the Electricity Commission's hands for a raise in wages brought, not a committee consultation, but the issue of letters from the office to twenty cities to ascertain prevailing rates.

49. The joint report, page 156, says of Indianapolis just the contrary: "The question of a man's politics never counts in making appointments." In the three municipalized cities mentioned, the attitude of the managers investigated was indifference to all institutions or individuals not backed by a pull.

50. Not correct. The private undertakings of New Haven, Indianapolis, and Atlanta had had no labor troubles. And not a single word of testimony was obtained to show that the Philadelphia gas company ever had the least difficulty with any union; its labor conditions were above the criticisms of union officials. In Chicago, the peculiar conditions of the union situation, just noted, resulting in a lack of the necessary study by union officials of how

the companies' workmen might be organized, was most probably the obstacle. On the other hand, the Detroit municipal electric works had beaten the union in a strike and employed non-unionists; and little Norwalk's municipal works had been made—like the Vatican—"extra territorial" by the union, and not interfered with. Investigator Commons' use of the word "hostile" requires his own definition. His fabrications here plainly were written for quotation by his deluded supporters.

51. Now defunct. The Municipal Employees' Association takes in the unskilled electric workers, but prefers that the skilled go into the engineers.

52. The President of the International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen says he finds less difficulty in organizing the employees of municipal, state, and Federal buildings in New York, of whom there are many hundreds, than the employees of private establishments. Public officials are approachable—in October.

53. The crookedness of this statement as made is apparent when the reader knows that there was no branch of this union found in New Haven, Atlanta, or Indianapolis; hence no members in the private undertakings in these places. In Philadelphia, the union's business agent said that the gas company's wages were above the union scale and more than at the city's water works.

The presence of members of the stationary engineers' and firemen's unions in the municipal works is a fact complimentary to the shrewdness of the union officials, whose business it is to see that city jobs go to their organizations. A matter of little account on a small scale, to be regarded by citizens with an indifferent benevolence, this might be the beginning of a municipal ownership canker, were there numerous employees of many trades in various municipal undertakings.

54. It is almost exclusively a form of municipal employees' association.

55. Until 1892 the American street railway men were unorganized or badly organized. The number of members, while fluctuating year by year, rises considerably by five-year stages. Why did Investigator Commons go so far back as 1902, with its 36,000 members (as he alleges)? The President of the Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees writes me that in 1907 the organization had 300 unions, with more than 70,000 members, and that this year it has 80,000.

56. I deal somewhat with this fallacious presentation of the "minimum wage" idea in my review, page 61. Observe the possible deception in the percentage of differences if the reader overlooks exactly what Investigator Commons tries to compare. The "minimum" given for the municipality is the rate for a force of qualified men established through influences not operative in private employ—the insistence of united municipal employees, the yielding nature of Councillors handling other men's money, the crusade for "a living wage." The minimum quoted here for private employ is the rate paid the poorest grade of labor by employers not particularized and not among those investigated by our Commission. Where the skilled union scale was recognized in private employ, the municipal rates were paid. "Minimum wage" here attempts in vain a mathematical comparison of ratios relating to different classifications of labor.

The phrase, an echo of learned nonsense, counts for nothing except in political campaign consumption.

57. Not correct. I have (page 15) given the testimony of the Newcastle Gas Company's chief engineer that it pays better wages to common labor than the city. The big Newcastle electric company pays within a shade the same as the gas company. The Dublin tramway company pays as high wages for engineers, firemen and laborers as any municipality in Ireland for similar grades of labor. The London United Tramways Company, which is a suburban line having only about three miles of track in London boroughs, pays an allowable deduction from the urban rates of the County Council, just as Brooklyn's union wages are lower than Manhattan's, even in skilled organized trades. An ex-employee of the United Tramways Company recently said to me that, considering the easy work on its lines and the constant worry and hardships on the crowded County Council lines, he would regard employment for the company preferable at a decidedly lower percentage in wages. The Norwich tramway company pays its station men wages equal to the municipality's and better than is paid in several neighboring towns. These assertions of mine are based on the information given to the labor investigators by company officials, and on occasions by the workmen when interviewed or union officials or others. The investigators had not the exact and exhaustive data for a study of the shadings in the elusive question of laborers' wages, varying, as they do, in private employ, with the factors of age, physical ability, handiness, term of service, steadiness, etc. On the other hand, it seemed to me that the key to the fact that in some cases municipalities pay lower rates than private employers of the same locality while in others they pay much higher is found in the explainable further fact that in one branch of a municipal undertaking there are low wages, while in another there are high, as with the poorly paid office force and liberally paid works force at the Wheeling gas undertaking. Under the changing administrations of municipalities there is, as to the compensation of employees, either only the old established rate, which continues low so long as the employees concerned have no effective pull, or a liberality resultant on the fears or hopes of the Councillors for the employees' influence at election times, once the men are aroused for united effort. The postmen in America and Great Britain have obtained amelioration of slavish conditions only by ceaseless agitation after being organized.

58. Not correct. The general assertion with which he opens this paragraph could be made by Investigator Commons only by omitting from the list of quotations following it mention of the United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia, which, he well knew, pays better wages for a shorter day than the municipal fire and water departments. Other misstatements: Indianapolis—On obtaining the figures in the text (page 157, joint report) from the company in writing, I directed Investigator Commons' attention to the lower rate given in the table drawn up by him. He never corrected his table, but used its incorrect figures in computing his comparison in this paragraph. Allegheny—Public "snap"; not wages. Chicago—The exact facts are stated in the two-line footnote I added to Investigator Commons' table (or that of his students),

page 146, joint report. The $1.75 is paid by the companies only to a limited class of its laborers—coal shovelers from cars. The municipal lighting works have not this class, who are to it incapables, in view of civil service qualifications. Richmond—The municipal gas undertaking has its street mains work done by contract at the "private" employment rate mentioned (table, page 500, joint report). The philanthropist white man's municipality wears negro sweatshop clothing. Similarly, the London County Council has low workmen's tramway fares for the sections of its lines within London, where the Councillors' constituencies live, but has overlooked establishing them for their suburban sections, where the workmen are not among their constituents.

59. The statistics of his previous paragraph, worthless through their errors, become meaningless as a gauge of wage methods when now seen as "minimum rates and not the average rates nor the highest rates." The maximum rates, which run high in private employ, he has not quoted; comparative average rates depend on a parity of classifications, here non-existent. While the mind of the honest lay inquirer is naturally upon a comparison in general between the rates of pay by the municipalities and the companies investigated, in reply the Investigator dwells at length on misleading "minimum rates"—and mis-reports them.

By the "fundamental principle of trade unionism" a union, representing workingmen, establishes a scale for its members, men of the same trade, below which all agree not to work. The unqualified for the occupation do not become members. By its "minimum wage" for its high-grade laborers a municipality, as employer, establishes a blanket rate for various unskilled occupations only. Investigator Commons' confusion of ideas here arises from his habit of substituting indiscriminate general terms for several other terms applicable to distinguishable and even unlike facts.

60. Ample proof of the fallacy in minimum wage comparisons.

61. The municipal tramway undertakings we investigated in Great Britain represented the cream of the industry for the kingdom—the heart of the greatest cities, requiring in the motormen and conductors the highest development of physique and skill. The "fair" comparison instituted by Investigator Commons between the County Council tramways in London and the United Company's lines outside London, as we have seen, has its dark shades of unfairness.

62. Not correct. The table of scales in 1906, compared with the scales at the date of the organization of many of the unions furnished us by President Mahon, of the International Union, from his office records, and in possession of Investigator Commons when he wrote this paragraph, was doubtless the latest and perhaps the most complete statement of the kind in existence. He had half a year after obtaining it to submit, through his force of students, a proofsheet copy by mail to the officers of the 148 companies referred to in the table for verification of its figures, if that was necessary.

63. Not correct. A direct contradiction of his own assertion of a fact, page 102, twelve lines from foot of page. The "companies which cannot afford to risk a strike" have risked strikes and "succeeded in destroying the labor organizations"! Besides, see chapter

on South Metropolitan Gas Company, pages 16 to 23, for corrections of errors in every sentence regarding it in this paragraph.

64. Not correct. A contradiction of the statement in our joint report (page 497): "But high wages are no longer found on the payrolls [at Richmond] when one passes to the grades of the more skilled," and also of the statement of wage increases at Atlanta set out in the footnote to the table on page 500. The fact, as usual, is that the company pays a range of wages while the municipality pays a flat rate.

65. The same as for tramway companies, as I have explained in references 57 and 61.

66. See reference 46.

67. To Professor Bemis, this classifying his undertaking after the Edison Company and before the Philadelphia Gas Company must have appeared as a dubious and indefensible compliment. His bureau does not put one dollar into this channel of compensation to labor where either of these companies puts hundreds. For a possible tabular statement in parallel columns see pages 147, 149, 510, 513, 514, 516, joint report. The Edison-Commonwealth, South Metropolitan, and United Gas Companies' systems of welfare work are among the best to be found in any country. All the municipalities mentioned by Investigator Commons are in this respect in a much poorer class than these three companies. Not recognizing the methods of outright compensation beyond wages to all the workmen followed by the New Haven, Atlanta, and Indianapolis companies, while mentioning the cheap soup-house and slum reading room methods of the Glasgow and Leicester municipal undertakings, from which the workmen generally stand aloof, is a gross violation of any pretence at impartiality.

68. The obvious reason: British workingmen's benefit and insurance is more frequently practised within occupational lines; their trade unions in general, like the exceptional American railway brotherhoods, are in their foremost features benefit societies. American wage workers, with a higher level of pay and standard of living, take up with the whole body of citizens in insurance companies, as they do in building and loan associations. To find a British workman insured for $3,000 is as rare as to find one owning a three-thousand-dollar house.

69. Not correct. A return to his series of misrepresentations regarding this company. This malicious misstatement is corrected, page 19.

The footnote, page 109, is an interesting illustration of certain of my colleague's vicious habits as an investigator—self-contradiction, unguarded assertion, indefiniteness in expression, baseless assumption of thoroughness.

He brings here his only specification in his charge, that going outside the matters actually investigated by us is my "practice." Persistent plodder that he is, it may be depended upon that to find this one apparent example he went over my review as with a fine-tooth comb. And actually what is my statement? That the terms of service table for the Glasgow tramways "gave color" to this Socialist's assertions (page 76). The "Clarion's" article reaching me as I was about closing my review, I inserted the gist of it, having in mind (1) that my manuscript was to go direct to Investigator

Commons for necessary rectification between ourselves, and (2) that he had already, in pages 28-30 of our joint report, written as to the references required: "The applicant fills the schedule in his own handwriting, stating his name, address, age, height, weight, and whether married or single. He gives his references to present and previous employers, stating the length of service, nature of employment, reason for leaving, and wages, and whether willing to join the Department Friendly Society. These employers are then addressed with a 'private and confidential' blank schedule, which they are asked to fill in, by answering the following questions." Then follow questions intimately personal. "Other persons, not employers, referred to by the applicant, are asked similar questions" (which are printed therewith). If the result of all this filling in by former employers, etc., of blanks containing numerous printed questions is not "a written character" it would be interesting to learn what might answer the description. As to the second point made by the Socialist, the manager's explanation that lost tickets "must be regarded practically as cash" is in different words precisely the Socialist's statement. Third point: "I never heard it suggested that in our service men are supposed to report each other for neglect of duty." The Socialist failed here to give his evidence. Fourth point, as to uniforms—the Socialist seems to be correct. Fifth, as to mispunching tickets—the Socialist is right. Sixth and last—In the three years referred to, ending May 31, 1906, the number of traffic employees who left the Glasgow tramways was 1,439. Of these, 526 were dismissed and 913 resigned. In the seven electricity years of the tramways, 1902-1908, the total number of men leaving the traffic service alone was 3,612. Of these, 1,226 were dismissed and 2,384 resigned. By years, the number leaving was: 653, 589, 555, 464, 420, 471, 460; the dismissals being 194, 220, 202, 187, 137, 127, 161; the resignations, 459, 369, 353, 277, 283, 344, 299. Average per year, dismissals and resignations, 516 in a traffic force averaging 2,300 men. In the other branches of the service—the permanent way force and the car-works force—the total that left through dismissal or resignation in the seven years was 5,834; the grand total of vacancies (including the 3,612 traffic force) is therefore 9,446. The total number of men employed in all the tramway branches, by years, for the seven years (ending May 31 each year), was: 1902, 3,224; 1903, 3,306; 1904, 3,751; 1905, 4,480; 1906, 5,100; 1907, 4,960; 1908, 4,580. The teaching of these various sets of amazing figures is that, in the land where frequently a job descends through generations the municipality of Glasgow loses its tramway employees at a rate equaling the entire force every four years. The motormen and conductors go at the rate of all hands in each four and a half years. These facts, and the forestalling of unionizing the force through the obligatory department benefit society, wipe out all possibility of the street-car men of America clamoring for model Glasgow's municipal ownership conditions for themselves.

Observe Investigator Commons' devious moves on this point. 1. Instead of offering me privately the alleged corrections he obtained by writing to the Glasgow manager, he let my quotation in my review go in printed form to the public, that he might, a few pages further on, advertise that he had "run it down." 2. He

drew up his footnote in a form that suggested to the hasty reader that he was making serious corrections of the Socialist's statements, whereas he was actually on most counts stating confirmations. 3. Finally, he accounted for the apparent short terms among motormen and conductors by referring to "extension of service," while the following circumstances indicate that he was fully cognizant of the true state of facts: He wrote me from Glasgow, Aug. 2, 1906, while there on his second visit, to "check up" my notes, that he was "going thoroughly into the methods of appointment and promotion." He prints (page 25, Part II, Vol. II), a page of statistics relating to "appointments, promotions, and dismissals," but restricts his figures to officials having salaries of $1,000 and upward. He refers in the footnote we have just analyzed to the further information he had obtained by correspondence with the Glasgow tramways manager for the purpose of refuting my suggestion that the tramways men had found their hold on their places precarious. He prints (page 28, Part II, Vol. II), a table showing the length of service of the motormen and conductors in service Aug. 11, 1906. That is, it is clear he knew all about the almost incredible state of affairs in the quitting and discharging of men in the department, and he never gave the illuminating statistics as I give them now. They would have killed his whole deceitful argument. This is the work of the Thorough Investigator, to whom "selecting facts" that suited him would be "impossible."

Note the question put to the applicant regarding his willingness to join the Departmental Friendly Society. Then read, page 51, our joint report (Part II, Vol. II): "In both Glasgow and Liverpool the corporation [municipality] soon after municipalization, established friendly societies, to which both employees and the corporation contributed. To the existence of these organizations, described below, the union officials attribute a large part of their difficulty in organizing the employees, and they hold that the friendly societies were designed to take the place of the union." That is, had we municipal ownership spreading in the United States, the Glasgow Tramways Friendly Society would stand as a model to forestall organization of municipal employees on the trade union principle, though it may be sure they would get together election day. Investigator Commons somehow has overlooked the opportunity in this instance to bring into play the phrases he used in denouncing the South Metropolitan Gas Company's benefit scheme—"union wrecking," "smashing of the union," "destroying the labor organizations," "a system . . . ingeniously contrived to destroy the . . . union." And then there are these differences: The South Metropolitan Company tells its employees they are free to-day to join any union whatsoever. Its employees do not leave at the rate of 25 per cent of the force every year—nor do 10 per cent. They have a growing interest in the property. They can take an active part in politics whenever they are so inclined.

It was an unkind cut at Professors Bemis and Parsons when Investigator Commons condemned the introduction in reviews of "criticisms not investigated." Newspaper quotation by these gentlemen in their summaries is voluminous. Investigator Commons' own quotation from the Chicago "News-Record" against the Chicago Edison Company took on quite a harmless appearance when its statements were corrected by the company officials.

CONCLUSION.

BOTH SIDES NOW HEARD.

Had I co-operated on this Commission with a man whose discriminating powers in investigation had been revealed as a veritable talent, whose accuracy and expository skill in report making had betokened an alert intellect and a disciplined desire for the truth, whose bearing had been transparently sincere and dealings uniformly aboveboard, whose contact with company managers had brought him their respect, and whose attitude toward myself, present or absent, had been honorable, I would be distressed at my work as investigator being pronounced by him as unworthy my trust. But as our case now at length stands, with my side heard, the reader will know it is not for me to take to the penitential task of retrospection and introspection.

Reviewing my entire course with Professor Commons I fail to see how any manly nature could have expected from me treatment more consistently in line with justice and even generosity, or looked for opportunity more free to make the best of his claims than I accorded to him. If I have been guilty of any one omission in the wearisome tediousness of this Commission's work it has been that, yielding to my earnest hope for an impossible agreement as to the facts to be reported, I did not with sufficient firmness and sagacity defend character where he assailed it, compel him to produce proofs positive where he had but his own affirmations, and cut him short where he penned the divagations into which he was led by his bias.

My policy as committeeman, working intimately for months with the Five on Scope and Plan, and for half a year as one of the sub-committee of two conducting the British investigation, seems from the outcome to have been satisfactory to my other colleagues. Where among them there was superior special information I acknowledged it; where there was no cause for interference I held off; where there was good head-work or heart-work I believe it had promptly my recognition at every stage.

From beginning to end I gave Investigator Commons the full play of his rights, the precedence expected by an investigator of his experience, and the unlimited trust due a man of honor. My habit was not to insist that my first impressions were indubitable facts but to review with him all matters he might question, not to hold to what I had written for our joint report until I had seen whether every sentence expressed the truth to his mind, not to show fight where time might work its changes—my sole lapse in this last-named regard being on his abrupt and contemptuous maligning of a labor man, against whose character I had heard nothing previously.

If in his density he misinterpreted my deferential bearing, my "apologetic" attitude, as he once termed it, as the outcome of an excessive temperamental prudence or as an evidence of the tribute due him in his possible power to place me in a false position, to

him now the consequences. If he imagined that trying to reach concordance on facts in the report signified the suppression of facts in my review of high value to me or the narrowing of my views to his horizon, his was the stupidity. In giving him great lengths of rope I retained enough to hang him. I allowed him an almost unlimited field in which to follow his bent to build up his cause, he assumed every privilege within it, including that of making indiscriminate charges, until finally he arrived at slandering his teammate, and I have penned him up for the rest of his days.

I am now sure my theory for a report of the kind we were to issue was the true one. Proof sheets of our joint report should have been submitted in each case to the manager of the undertaking investigated, public or private, whether our findings were favorable or unfavorable. There is more truth for interested readers now in regard to the British private undertakings, since I have the managers' corrections, than Investigator Commons, in his shortsightedness, gave in his ill-judged writings about them. From this method, as followed by myself (only) in America, came a considerable amount of alteration. Corrections by the Secretary of the Chicago Edison Company took the sting out of Investigator Commons' matter quoted from the "News-Record" (page 143) and threw much light on the company's wage statistics (page 146); accurate wage statements came from the Indianapolis Water Company (page 157); changes were made by the President of the Atlanta Gas Company. In none of these cases was any attempt made to alter anything but obvious errors. The managers of the Cleveland and South Norwalk municipal undertakings, whose letters on the matter I have, had no suggestions for change in what I had written of them. Had Investigator Commons seen to it that I had a copy of his attack on me before it reached the public, I might not now be obliged to finish his career as a credible investigator, for our differences could perhaps have been settled in private before the Committee of Twenty-One. Years ago, as a writer on disputable questions, I was well convinced of the merits of "Hear the other side." There are no managers to-day in either America or Great Britain, to say that I have permitted them to rest under misrepresentation, and there are no managers or experts to express astonishment at my making claims of writing "the entire report as it stands . . . on the basis of facts which I personally investigated"—or at any other claims that they could call in question.

I believe also the plan of my review—restricting myself to salient and decisive considerations—was correct. My most closely interested readers, the wageworkers, wanted from me in a nutshell the outcome of our labor investigation, not only as to broad facts bearing on employees' welfare and trade unionism, but also as to the general influence of municipal ownership on character in citizenship and the well being of the masses. That is what I had space to give. There was not wanted grandmotherly taps of approbation alternated with thimble raps of disapproval on inconsequential points—a report that looked east, west, and nowhere, and balanced everything but comprehensive truths. If there is any background of principle in the demand for a "judicial" report, it relates, not to a mousing over of endless minutiæ of the evidence in a sophomoric essay, but to the clear-cut opinions of a judge on the bench, who,

disregarding irrelevant matter and the lesser issues involved in a case, brings out succinctly its deep-lying and far-reaching merits.

If in my review I displayed a consistency with economic principles I have held for twenty years, it cannot be said I twisted facts for our joint report to support those principles. Investigator Commons himself has fathered all the facts in that report for all the undertakings "except New Haven and Philadelphia."

And if I allowed him a free rein in re-writing Socialist diatribes against the British companies, I had one motive among others for my indifference to their effect, if true, that I had from him in my pocket an agreement to help put before the public through the Committee of Twenty-One the substance, in fact most of the very items, of the essentially anti-municipal report which that Committee afterward agreed on. I was persistent while in Madison in getting that agreement drawn up on notes he took when he and I discussed the question of the Twenty-One's report; he told me later he was working over the matter with colleagues of his side, and I regarded the question settled against the pro-municipalists once they could admit the recognitions of private ownership and detail the unattainable conditions for municipal ownership in America embodied in the paper.

I assert that truth has been my constant aim—in the joint report, in my review, and in this rejoinder. I have played to no gallery, written no passage for garbled quotation, and I invite a fair review of all my work.

I can meet every man I ever came in contact with in this investigation and feel that I have done him no injustice. I treated Professor Commons to the last with all forbearance, to the limits of mercifulness. When a third party coming forward to us both with overtures for peace last year confidently set out to induce him to eliminate his attack on me from his review, even after it had appeared in the newspapers, I entertained the proposal. But to be stubbornly vengeful has been his choice, and continuing to show him a consideration persistently despised would be fatuous.

I would have welcomed a fine reply to my review by my opponent. Lucid reasoning on a high plane, keen insight into principles I might have seen but dimly, the short cut to logical results I had overlooked, original views of social obligations, the gratifying surprise of a defeat at points where I had been too sure, a dexterous seizure of unconscious concessions had I made them, a literary dress above an almshouse inventory—on such features I would have sent him my hearty congratulations.

However much I was stung by his allusions to myself and astonished at his reckless statements as to "indorsement" of municipal ownership in Glasgow by its opponents, and the like falsifying passages that stud his production, the lasting and deepest effects on me of reading his review were disappointment at the indignity he had committed on the Commission and regret at the retribution he had invited upon himself. The bewilderment he exhibited as to the fundamental lessons to be adduced from our extended observations, and his meanderings from incoherent imitations of the conventionalities of professorial writing to taxing me with the very sins against fairness that he himself was committing, with his display of

MAR 8 1909

resentment at my presenting a course of reasoning he could not answer, evoked my profound sympathy for his pettiness in mind, heart and spirit.

If as one of the coterie of college Socialists—he is a member of the New York "X" Club, a panegyrist of the Fabians, an accepted fellow of the semi-Socialist secretaries who insinuate themselves into half-charity, half-radical societies—he aimed to destroy another labor representative who refuses to de-Americanize himself by adopting their misplaced old-world communistic creed, he may now contemplate a ruin of closer personal interest to himself. In striking back at him I do duty, on behalf of all trade unionist leaders, against the gang who would "convert them or annihilate them."

In his attack on my integrity as an investigator, as also in his attacks on both the British and American companies as honorable business agencies, he produced not a written or printed line to support his allegations. But for every charge of any kind I herein make against him I have the clinching documentary evidence.

Before I was on hand to watch him, he was in the habit of issuing without check the sort of literature on which much municipal ownership propaganda depended. After he got away from my immediate supervision and investigated on his own hook and penned his review, he fell into his old inveterate habits of unreason and untruth.

While he has for years allowed to be well advertised his side of his woes as a reformer in college life, in reviewing his course on this Commission in all charity, it cannot but recur to the reader that there may be other explanations than his own why he was dropped from college professorships twice.

Let no one imagine that I write for reinstatement in any circle of men to gain any material thing within their gift to my personal advantage. With the "public" and "employers'" groups of the Civic Federation possessed of this reply to the overt assault on the good faith of one of the labor representatives under their eye in the municipal investigation, and a covert assault on his honor, I step back into the ranks of organized labor, my business with the other groups done and my inclination to join in public service with them gone.

LB Ag '09

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 003 945 442 7